The American Ecclesiastical Review

Vol. CXX, No. 1 JANUARY, 1949

CONTENTS

The Great Intercession in the Roman Liturgy
William J. Lallou 1

Is Ours a Missionary Country? . *Paul Hanly Furfey* 8

Opinions Concerning Doctrinal Development
Charles E. Sheedy, C.S.C. 19

Mixed Marriages in 1947 . . *Edward S. Dunn, S.J.* 33

Ratum Non Consummatum. Part III
Thomas Owen Martin 43

Faith and the Church . . *Joseph Clifford Fenton* 57

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS

The *N.* of the Prayer *A Cunctis* 69

Correcting a Non-Liturgical Altar 70

The *Lavabo* when there is no Server 71

Published monthly by The Catholic University of America Press, Washington 17, D. C. Subscription price in U. S. currency or equivalent: United States, Canada, $5.00; Foreign, $5.00. 50 cents per copy.

Entered as second class matter, November 30, 1944, at the Post Office at Washington, D. C., under the Act of March 3, 1879. Accepted for mailing at the special rate of postage provided for under Act of March 5, 1930, under Act of February 28, 1925.

Business communications, including subscriptions and changes of address, should be addressed to The American Ecclesiastical Review, The Catholic University of America Press, Washington 17, D. C.

Please address all manuscripts and editorial correspondence to The Editor, The American Ecclesiastical Review, The Catholic University of America, Washington, D. C.

Copyright 1949, by The Catholic University of America Press

A problem in Restitution 71

Suffrages for a Deceased Non-Catholic 72

BOOK REVIEWS

Catholic Social Action, *by John E. Cronin, S.S.* 74

Pardon and Peace, *by Alfred Wilson, C.P.* 74

Institutiones iuris canonici. Vol. IV,
by Matthaeus Conte a Coronata 76

A Practical Commentary on the Code of Canon Law
by Stanislaus Woywod, O.F.M. 77

Paradise Hunters, *by W. Kane, S.J.* 78

BOOK NOTES 79

YOU WOULDN'T make an important purchase from an itinerant speculator who has no "after-the-sale" interest in your needs, would you?
The purchase of Liturgical Fabrics demands the same discriminating consideration. Dependable Church Goods Dealers stock "Allen" fabrics for Altar Draperies and Sacred Vestments. They are the finest liturgical fabrics on the market today and they are trustworthily priced. The designs are original and the Allen Silk Mills, which manufactures nothing but Church fabrics, stands back of every yard of goods it produces.

"Buy American"

ALLEN SILK MILLS
Manufacturers
Charles M. Muench, *Executive Director*
140 West 31st Street New York 1, N. Y.
In Canada: Allen Silk Mills (Canada) Ltd.
400 Craig Street West — Montreal
VESTMENT FABRICS BANDINGS
DRAPERY FABRICS EMBLEMS
Sold exclusively through Church Goods Dealers

THE GREAT INTERCESSION IN THE ROMAN LITURGY

In the technical language of liturgical writers, the Great Intercession is a prayer for the Church and for all men, including the faithful departed, along with some memory of the saints, found, usually in connection with the Anaphora, in all liturgies. St. Paul (*I Tim.* 2:1,2) speaks of his desire that "supplications, prayers, intercessions, and thanksgivings be made for all men; for kings and for all who are in high station." To the same all-embracing species of prayer, evidently, there is reference in the Acts of the Apostles, (2:42) where we read: "And they were persevering in the doctrine of the apostles and in the communication of the breaking of bread and *in prayers.*"

At all events, the Intercession is an element, universally found in every liturgy, ancient and medieval, Eastern and Western. In the West Syrian and Byzantine Liturgies, it follows the consecration (and Epiclesis). In Egypt, it interrupts the Preface, and in the Nestorian and Chaldean Rites it comes between the words of institution and the Epiclesis. In our own Roman Liturgy, the Great Intercession is in the anomalous form of a divided prayer, part of it coming before the consecration and the second part after the consecration. In other rites, we find two distinct Intercessions. One is at the beginning of the Mass of the Faithful, usually in the form of a litany, with petitions by the deacon, answers by the people, and a concluding prayer by the celebrant. A second Intercession, which is properly the Great Intercession, comes commonly at the end of the Anaphora, as a prayer by the celebrant, often accompanied by a litany led by the deacon.

The First Apology of St. Justin Martyr speaks of an Intercession at the beginning of what we should call the Mass of the Faithful. We read (LXV, 1) that the newly-baptized is led into the assembly of the brethren where common prayers are said for the people, for him who has been enlightened (i.e. baptized) and for all others everywhere. The Eighth Book of the Apostolic Constitutions gives us the text of the intercessary prayers which inaugurate the Mass of the Faithful, and *Testamentum Domini* (I, 35) has an even longer set of supplications by the deacon which form an Inter-

cession. All Eastern Liturgies preserve the same introduction to the Mass of the Faithful and authorities are generally agreed that the same was present in the Gallican rite and originally in the Roman rite also. In the latter, it was the long-lost Prayers of the Faithful, of which the pattern survives in the prayers of the Good Friday service, immediately preceding the unveiling of the cross.

It is with the second or Great, Intercession (that connected with the Anaphora) that we are concerned in this article. Serapion (Euchologion, XIII, 4) has such an Intercession following the consecration and Logos-Epiclesis. *Constitutiones Apostolorum* (VIII, xii, 40-50) give us a very lengthy Intercession at the same place in the Liturgy, namely, after the consecration and the Epiclesis, which is this time an invocation of the Holy Spirit. The same work (VIII, xiii, 3-9) has a diaconal litany succeeding the Intercession pronounced by the bishop. *Testamentum Domini* (I, 23) likewise contains an Intercession, briefer in extent, after the Anamnesis and its succeeding prayer. St. Cyril of Jerusalem (*Catcheses,* V, 8,9) places an Intercession after the Epiclesis of the Liturgy. The Byzantine Rite, both in its ninth century form and its present-day usage, has an Intercession following the invocation of the Holy Spirit.[1] The Liturgy of St. James, of the Syrian Rite, has the Intercession immediately after the Epiclesis, as has also the Liturgy of the Syrian Jacobites.[2] The Liturgy of St. Mark contains an intra-Anaphoral Intercession, incidental to what we should call the Preface. This is its position in all liturgies derived from the parent one of Alexandria.[3] Included in this class is the Liturgy of the Abyssinian Church.[4] The Persian, or East Syrian, Rite places its Intercession between the consecration (words of institution) and the Epiclesis, while the Armenian Rite follows the Antiochene order with its lenghty Intercession coming after the invocation of the Holy Spirit.

In our present Mass according to the Roman Liturgy, the Intercession is divided. The first half comes before the consecration and begins with the words "in primis" of the *Te igitur,* the open-

[1] Cf. Brightman, *Eastern Liturgies* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1896), pp. 331 ff., 387 ff.

[2] Cf. *ibid.*, pp. 54 ff., 89 ff.

[3] Cf. *ibid.*, pp. 126 ff., 165 ff.

[4] Cf. *ibid.*, pp. 228 ff.

ing prayer of the Canon, and extends to the *Hanc igitur.* The Intercession is resumed after the consecration with the *Memento pro defunctis,* coming, therefore, in the usual place for the Intercession in a liturgy of Antochene origin. How, then, did our Intercession become separated into two parts? When the separation was effected, why was the first half inserted among the pre-consecratory prayers and not associated with the Preface as in the Egyptian liturgies?

No perfectly satisfactory answer to these two associated questions has been reached by students of the history of liturgy. Both are bound up with the original form of the Roman Canon, concerning the structure of which scholars have long been divided. All agree that the present arrangement of our Canon is not the primitive one, which antedated at least Pope St. Gregory the Great, the last Pontiff to touch the Roman Anaphora. The Canon now begins with the *Te igitur,* a prayer which opens by asking God to bless and accept our offering and then abruptly, at the words *in primis,* passes into an Intercession, with supplications for the Church, the Pope, the bishop, and the faithful. This idea is continued in the *Memento vivorum* and the *Communicantes.* A *per Christum Dominum nostrum. Amen* ends this first half of the Intercession as the prayer for the acceptance of the *oblata* is resumed with the *Hanc igitur.* The three prayers after the consecration are concluded with a *per eundem Christum Dominum nostrum. Amen* as, with another abrupt transition, immediately following the third prayer, *Supplices Te rogamus,* without logical sequence, the Intercession is taken up again with the *Memento pro defunctis* and the *Nobis quoque peccatoribus.*

It is quite agreed that the Roman Anaphora, or Canon, was originally one continuous prayer, in the course of which the consecration was effected. Such it was in the earliest description of the Mass, that of St. Justin Martyr (*I Apol.* lxv, 3; lxvii, 5), where it is told that the bishop recited his prayers and thanksgivings to which the people gave assent by crying out "Amen." So it was in Apostolic Constitutions, Book VIII, the Anaphora concluding with the invocation of the Holy Spirit (Epiclesis) before the prayer of Intercession begins. Such, too, is the structure of Oriental Liturgies to-day, as we have noted above. In no one of them do we find an Intercession inserted in the midst of the eucharistic prayer

itself. (It is true, however, that in East Syria it comes before the Epiclesis.) The Gallican Rite had its post-Sanctus prayer leading directly to the consecration, which was followed by the Anamnesis and a kind of Epiclesis.[5] In the Mozarabic Rite, the Intercession comes in the old Gallican place, before the Preface. In the Ambrosian Rite of Milan, the Roman Canon has supplanted the original one, with some slight variations and some faint vestiges of its archaic form.

The present state of the Roman Canon, with its abrupt transitions, breaking it up into several prayers, introducing the conclusion *Per Christum Dominum nostrum* four times during the course of the Canon instead of just once at the end, represents it as it has been since our earliest extant text of it, that of the Gelasian Sacramentary of the seventh or eighth century. This has given rise to several theories as to the original form of the Roman Canon, before the time of Pope St. Gregory I (590-604), and why and when it was recast from its older arrangement. These various conjectured reconstructions of the Canon have been treated, in excellent summary, in Fortescue's *The Mass*.[6]

Christian Bunsen's theory is that our present Canon is the result of the fusion of two sets of prayers, one assigned to the celebrant and the other formerly recited by the deacon. When the latter ceased to read the diptychs and the associated Intercession, the celebrant inserted these in the prayers which he used to recite simultaneously with those of the deacon. This explanation of the present disordered succession of prayers in the Canon is ingenious and plausible but, unfortunately, it is unsupported by documentary evidence. The other attempted reconstructions of the original Roman Canon fall into two categories. The first of these comprises those scholars who hold that the various forms of the old Gallican Rite are simply variations of the original Roman Mass and so the Great Intercession came in the old Roman Liturgy before the Preface, as it does in the Gallican Mass, as in the description of it usually attributed to St. Germanus, of the sixth century.[7] The second school holds to the Eastern origin of the Roman Rite,

[5] Cf. Duchesne, *Origines du culte chrétien*, 5th ed. (Paris: Boccard, 1925), p. 226.

[6] London: Longmans, Green and Co., 1917. Cf. pp. 138-71.

[7] Cf. Duchesne, *op. cit.*, pp. 200 ff.

either from Jerusalem-Antioch or Alexandria via Ravenna, or possibly a combination of these two influences which produced the present Roman Canon, with its obvious dislocations. This last is the theory elaborated by Antony Baumstark in his *Liturgia Romana e Liturgia dell'Esarcato,* published in Rome in 1904. Of this same school, Paul Drews, in *Zur Entstehungsgeschicte des Kanons in der römischen Messe* (Tübingen, 1902), bases the Roman Canon on that of the Greek liturgy of St. James, and seeks to restore the primitive order of its prayers by arranging them in a manner corresponding to their sequence in St. James. This brings the prayers comprising the Intercession (*Te igitur, Memento pro vivis, Communicantes, Memento pro defunctis, Nobis quoque peccatoribus*) all after the consecration and after the *Supplices Te rogamus,* which latter evidently formerly contained an Epiclesis. The rearrangement was made to produce some accord between the Roman Rite and that of Alexandria, where the Intercession precedes the Preface. So, according to Drews, the *Te igitur* and the first half of the Intercession were moved to the beginning of the Canon, the remainder being left where it was originally, in the Jerusalem-Antioch location, after the Epiclesis, which had been reduced to its present fragmentary form, being simply a petition for a fruitful Holy Communion.

As to the time when this recasting took place, the conjecture generally accepted is that it occurred some time between that of Pope Innocent I, when he wrote to Decentius (416), and the reign of Pope St. Gregory I (590-604). Innocent I wrote to Decentius, Bishop of Gubbio, insisting on conformity in the West with the usage of Rome, saying, among other things, that the reading of the names and the consequent Intercession should come after the Consecration, not before, where Decentius had been accustomed to read them. St. Gregory the Great is set down as marking the latest time at which any recasting could be done as it is generally agreed that he was the last pontiff to alter the Canon of the Mass. It is he who is supposed to have suppressed the Epiclesis in the Roman Liturgy because of the conviction that consecration was effected by the words of institution, independently of any subsequent invocation either of the Logos or the Holy Spirit. If the words of consecration effect what they state then a later invocation begging that the Holy Spirit (or the Divine Word) change the

bread and wine into the Body and Blood of Christ is quite unnecessary. The removal of the Epiclesis admittedly was one of the causes of the rearrangement of the Canon, resulting in the present Roman Anaphora, with its abrupt transitions and lack of consistent order.

The conjectured reconstructions of the original Roman Canon and the suggested reasons underlying the rearrangement of it remain in the domain of conjecture and suggestion. However plausible the arguments advanced by the proponents of the various theories, they all suffer from lack of documentary support. What we may reasonably conclude from the solutions proposed seems to be limited to the following four propositions:

(1) The original Roman Canon was one continuous prayer, whose core was the consecration. Such a prayer is indicated by St. Justin Martyr and such a one appears in the Liturgy of Apostolic Constitutions, Book VIII, as well as in the text of the Canon contained in St. Ambrose's *De sacramentis* (IV, v, 21, 22; vi, 27). The unbroken Anaphora is likewise found in all the Eastern Liturgies, the Persian Rite presenting a slight exception.

(2) The primitive Roman Mass had its Intercession in common with all liturgies. It seems most probable that this Great Intercession, in its complete form, with its supplications for both the living and the dead, came in one place. It seems also quite probable that this place was at the conclusion of the Canon, after the Epiclesis, which was suppressed, most likely in the sixth century. This would accord with the more generally received opinion that the Roman Liturgy stems from Jerusalem-Antioch, where the Intercession follows the Epiclesis. (The East Syrian, or Persian, Rite places the Intercession between the words of institution and the Epiclesis.) The rites, of which Alexandria is the parent stock, make the Intercession incidental to what corresponds to the Preface of the Roman Mass. If the Intercession followed the Canon in the original liturgy of Rome, it is only the first half of it, that containing the *Memento pro vivis* and the *Communicantes,* which was transferred to its present position, the second half, the *Memento pro defunctis* and the *Nobis quoque peccatoribus,* remaining in its primitive place.

(3) The present Roman Canon represents a recasting of its original form, due to the anomalous transposition of the first sec-

tion of the Intercession so that it comes before the consecration and interrupts the logical sequence of the prayers leading from the *Sanctus* to the words of institution. This rearrangement was effected during the period between 416, the date of Pope Innocent I's letter to Decentius, in which he speaks of the Roman usage of reading the diptychs, and consequently reciting the Intercession, after the consecration, and the time of the reign of St. Gregory the Great (590-610) since it is universally admitted that no change in the Canon has been made since he last touched it. There is considerable cogency in the contention that the recasting of the Canon had some connection with the suppression of the Epiclesis. For example, the *Te igitur* can be more logically explained as a prayer which originally followed the Epiclesis and connected it with the Great Intercession that it can be as the transition between the *Sanctus* and the Intercession into which it now passes abruptly at the words *in primis*.

When we come to the moot question of just why the rearranged Canon took its present form, with the prior half of the Intercession super-imposed on the opening of the Anaphora, with all the consequent difficult transitions, reduplicated endings, and strange interruptions of the continuity of the consecration prayer, scholars have little to say that is convincing. We need the evidence of a text and none is available. It is not beyond possibility, however, that some twentieth-century Jean Mabillon will uncover some sixth or seventh century manuscript which will show us the Mass of the Roman Rite either in its original form or even in the process of transition to its present state. But such a *deus ex machina* belongs only in the realm of wishful thinking.

WILLIAM J. LALLOU

The Catholic University of America
Washington, D. C.

MISSION INTENTION

The Mission Intention for the month of January, 1949, is for "The Catholic Schools in China."

IS OURS A MISSIONARY COUNTRY?

In 1943 two French priests published a book *La France, pays de mission?*[1] which attracted a considerable attention. Their thesis was that France had strayed so far from the Faith that traditional methods of dealing with the people could no longer be considered efficacious; they would have to be revised in the spirit of the methods which the Church uses in missionary countries. A number of French priests are experimenting with such revisions, partly under the conscious influence of this book, but more usually as a result of parallel thinking which led them independently to similar conclusions. The whole movement is extremely interesting and deserves close attention. The purpose of the present article is to inquire whether the ideas circulating among our French confreres may contain some elements of practical interest to ourselves, the priests of the United States.

Is ours a missionary country? In the technical sense, certainly not. We are not under the *S. Congregatio de Propaganda Fide.* We do not depend on foreign countries for the recruitment of our clergy and nuns and the financial support of our activities. We give to, rather than receive from, missionary societies. Yet the fact remains that roughly five-sixths of the population of the country is non-Catholic. By canon law the responsibility for the five-sixths rests on our ecclesiastical authorities (Canon 1350). In our thinking and in our action should we not give more attention to the problem of the five-sixths? Does not the mere presence of this overwhelming majority of non-Catholics among us force us logically to think of the United States as, in some sense, a missionary country?

Of course there is nothing particularly original in the thoughts suggested in the last paragraph.[2] However, there is something new and fresh in the way French priests approach parallel problems and perhaps their approach can yield new insights for ourselves.

[1] H. Godin and Y. Daniel, *La France, pays de mission?* (Paris: Les Éditions du Cerf, 1943).

[2] For example, see the excellent article, James J. Navaugh, "The Pastor and Non-Catholics," *AER,* CXVIII, 4 (April, 1948), 241-47.

To make the problem concrete, let us imagine a typical, good, American, city parish of five thousand souls. The pastor and assistants are intelligent, energetic, and devoted to their work. They are regular in their spiritual exercises and they live harmoniously together. The parish is "well-organized." There are a wide variety of pious societies and recreational and educative activities for the different age, sex, and interest groups. Let us suppose that the parish is in a relatively Catholic area, an area one-third Catholic. Even at that, there are ten thousand non-Catholics within the parish limits in addition to the five thousand Catholics. How much actual attention do the ten thousand receive? When prospective converts ring the rectory doorbell, they are well received and many are eventually instructed and baptized. Yet if this is a typical good parish as we know such parishes, how much time, attention, and thought is given to the balance of the ten thousand?

French writers belonging to the new movement are used to parallel situations and their criticism is that the priests of the parish are interested in the *milieu paroissial,* the sphere of parish life which centers immediately around the church, rather than in the whole parish as such.[3] A priest feels at home in the *milieu paroissial;* it is a congenial atmosphere. The good people yield him a flattering deference. In the midst of the busy round of parish activities it is too easy for the pastor to forget the ten thousand. He ceases to look on them as *commendatos sibi in Domino* (Canon 1350), persons for whose salvation he is officially answerable before God.

But how can our busy parochial clergy find time for much missionary effort? Are not five thousand Catholics, with widely varying degrees of fervor, with a wide variety of personal problems, far more than enough to occupy the full time of the priests in the parish? Faced with similar objections, the French writers reply flatly that lack of missionary activity cannot be ascribed to a shortage of priests. Abbé Godin once met a missionary who boasted of the Urundi-Ruanda mission in the Congo. There were as many practicing Catholics there as in the city of Paris in a general population of about the same size, yet there were only a tenth as many priests. The missionary added: "We might increase tenfold the

[3] Cf. G. Michonneau, *Paroisse, communauté missionnaire* (Paris, Les Éditions du Cerf, 1945), pp. 51-62.

number of our priests; we might have an impressive budget. If we were to use your methods, we would come to the same result as you. The territory gained would be maintained with great difficulty and little by little *we would lose ground, like you.*" [4]

The French priest, the critics claim, spends a disproportionate amount of his time with *oeuvres*—"parish activities," we would say. The term includes athletic teams, Scouts, dramatic societies, clubs, camps, dispensaries, soup kitchens, study circles, parish movies and the like. Without doubt many of these *oeuvres* should be retained; they have a genuine value. Yet the whole question needs re-examination; each activity should be evaluated and it should be ruthlessly discarded unless it can justify the drain on the priest's time which it involves. It is hard to justify purely recreational activities. Is the priest ordained to become an athletic coach? There are not enough excellent films available to provide for regular parish movies; if the scheme is tried, sooner or later questionable films will be used, with resulting scandal. It is much better to encourage laymen to start a campaign and clean up the local movie house. Charitable activities should be turned over to congregations of nuns and to lay organizations specialized for the purpose. The priest who has been assigned to parish work should follow the example of the Apostles. "It is not desirable that we should forsake the word of God and serve at tables. . . . We will devote ourselves to prayer and to the ministry of the word" (Acts, 6:2,4). The priest should restrict himself to those *oeuvres* which have a direct missionary value.[5]

Being freed from an excessive burden of *oeuvres,* the priest will have more time for the missionary activity which is distinctively his, *l'apostolat direct,* the direct apostolate. The priest makes converts when he talks about Christ and the Church to non-Catholics or fallen-away Catholics individually or in small conversational groups. Why spend so much time on elaborate organizational activities when our main job is, after all, so simple? St. Paul did not spend more time than necessary on organizations. He entered into direct contact with the people. He talked religion to them in

[4] Godin-Daniel, *op. cit.,* p. 84.

[5] Cf. Michonneau, *op. cit.,* pp. 103-172. The parochial school is not discussed by Abbé Michonneau nor will it be discussed in the present article. French experience offers no helpful parallels to our conditions.

season and out of season and we should do the same thing. The priest should eagerly seize every opportunity to talk to outsiders about religion, and, moreover, he should go out of his way to create opportunities. They will seldom be offended; they expect it of him. The priest should devote every possible moment to this apostolic work.

French priests have found that they can multiply their effectiveness by making due use of apostolic lay people, the *militants.* The term is used most frequently of the more active members of *les mouvements spécialisés,* that is, such movements as the Jocistes, the *Mouvement Populaire des Familles,* and allied groups which specialize their energies on the Christianization of some particular social class or other segment of society. In a broader sense a *militant* is a person who is not only serious about his own religious life, but who also—and this is the essential point—devotes himself actively to the conversion of others. The *militants* can penetrate into corners inaccessible to the priest. Their words carry conviction when they are addressed to others similar to themselves, girls working on the same assembly line, boys standing around on the same street corner, fathers of families facing the same housing problem. The *mouvements spécialisés* are felt to belong in an entirely different category from the ordinary *oeuvres.* The priest is in no danger of wasting his time by devoting too much attention to them because they further the direct apostolate instead of diverting attention from it.

Can it be that we American priests have underestimated the apostolic abilities of lay people? The work of the Legion of Mary has opened the eyes of some of us, and the Legion is by no means an isolated example. Indeed, wherever lay people have been given proper encouragement and guidance, they have always proved astonishing in their effectiveness. These lay apostles can carry on missionary work in a parish even when the priest's time is limited. Can we not even think of paid lay catechists?[6] The idea would certainly not shock a foreign missionary; for we all know the part that such catechists play in missionary countries.

Some elements in the French experience seem, at first sight, to be inapplicable to American conditions. One is the class barrier which separates priest and people, particularly in French working-

[6] Cf. *ibid.,* pp. 246 ff. (section by Abbé Rétif).

class parishes. All qualified observers agree that in the mind of the French workingman the Church is very closely associated with the bourgeoisie. It is beside the point to inquire into the origin of this prejudice which probably finds its explanation in the history of the last two centuries. It surprises us in America where Catholicism has often been despised in the past as the religion of immigrants and slum dwellers. Yet there is some danger that, with increasing prosperity, the Church may here also be linked, in the popular mind, with the bourgeois point of view. Even now there exist certain straws which show which way the wind blows. Therefore it is well to examine the situation in France, if only to forestall future mistakes.

There is a very definite feeling in certain French quarters that a priest working in a proletarian district must consciously separate himself from bourgeois culture and become in spirit a member of the proletariat. It is a question of a genuine *déclassement*, a voluntary renunciation of social class. The most extreme and dramatic example of this *déclassement* is given by the priest-workmen who shed their clerical garb and take working-class jobs in factories or elsewhere. Some priests try the experiment only temporarily. For example, a seminary professor may work in a factory during vacation so that his classes may be more realistic when he returns in the fall. Others work for a longer period, perhaps two or three years, and then leave their job to continue the apostolate among the workers, still without the soutane. The priest-workmen not only take proletarian jobs and wear proletarian clothes, they also live, alone or in small groups, in the same types of houses as their fellow workers. They try to adopt the customs of the class as far as possible; for instance, they are quite usually called by their first names without the conventional titles of respect.

To meet a priest-workman is a rather surprising experience. My first meeting with one of them occurred one Sunday afternoon last summer in a working-class quarter on the outskirts of Paris. He was a curly-haired young man with an infectious grin. He wore a short-sleeved sweater, shabby trousers, and sandals. He had been working in a paper factory from six that morning until two in the afternoon, whereupon he had gone home, celebrated his Mass, and eaten lunch. We talked in a shack, literally that, where another group of priest-workmen lived. The young priest was most

enthusiastic about his work. He felt that it was very hard to understand the psychology and the problems of the working class without becoming a part of it. It was his duty to demonstrate Catholicism in the factory by being known as a priest and trying to live up to the ideals of the priesthood. When I asked about conversions, he answered that, although some conversions did take place, the aim of his confreres and himself was, not so much to convert individuals, as to work for the gradual conversion of a whole class.

There is probably hardly anyone who would advocate the priest-workman technique in the United States. Even in France it is regarded as highly experimental and is permitted by the hierarchy only in very exceptional circumstances and with the reservation that such permissions must not be regarded as establishing a precedent. However, the priest-workmen do have a lesson for us. They dramatize the necessity of remaining close to the people. The class barrier that so often separates the clergy from the faithful is probably the greatest obstacle to the progress of the Church in France. It would be tragic if such an obstacle should make its appearance in the United States. The priest whose comfortable living contrasts sharply with the poverty of his parishioners, the priest whose distaste toward the Negro members of his parish is visible, the priest who curries favor with the more prominent and wealthier Catholics of his neighborhood, can all contribute, perhaps quite unthinkingly and unknowingly, to the erection of barriers which may seriously hinder the continued growth of the Church.

The money question is particularly delicate. It is perfectly reasonable for the priest to appeal to his parishioners for the support of the parish; but the appeal has often been made so tactlessly, not to say crudely, in the past that the average French workingman is apt to look upon the Church as essentially a business. "To the worker," says Abbé Michonneau, "we are carrying on a trade, apparently a profitable one." [7] To counteract this calumnious notion, it is necessary to be circumspect; above all, one must avoid giving the impression that sacred things are for sale and that every minor service has its corresponding fee. Perhaps the most radical solution to the problem is that of Abbé Remillieux at the parish

[7] *Ibid.*, p. 303.

of Notre-Dame Saint Alban on the outskirts of Lyons. The sole means for raising money is a box in the back of the church into which the parishioners drop their contributions anonymously. A weekly bulletin sent to all the regular members of the parish gives the amount contributed and an exact account of expenditures. The attitude of Abbé Remillieux has made a profound impression. In 1944, when a *Comité de Libération* was organized in the quarter, he was chosen by acclamation as vice-president. When he expressed his surprise and wondered why he had been chosen, someone answered, "*Vous au moins, vous avez vaincu l'argent.*" [8] Sacerdotal enthusiasm in the collection of money has not entirely escaped lay criticism in this country. Certainly we shall be more effective apostles if it can be said also of us that we have conquered money.

French priests are giving a good deal of thought to the problem of making the liturgy more intelligible to the people. This is a desirable result even in the most fervently Catholic district, but it is still more urgent in a missionary area where prospective converts, catechumens, and recently baptized adults may be present in church. The first essential is to carry out the ceremonies with rubrical exactitude. With bitter humor the French critics draw pictures of the all too typical Sunday Mass with the priest at the altar mumbling the prayers unintelligibly and hurrying carelessly through the sacred ceremonies before a sleepy and distracted congregation. It is not surprising that, when the priest celebrates Mass carelessly, the congregation, for its part, will assist carelessly.

Certain devices, some familiar, some not unknown in this country, are being used in France to encourage the active participation of the laity in the Mass. These include the popularization of vernacular Missals, the offertory procession, the dialogue Mass, the reading aloud of the proper in translation during the Mass, and similar devices. One may see a particularly thoroughgoing application of such methods in the Sunday parish Mass at Notre-Dame Saint Alban. Mass is celebrated *coram populo* by another priest while Abbé Remilleaux assists in alb and diaconal stole in

[8] H. Ch. Chery, *Communauté paroissiale et liturgie, Notre-Dame Saint Alban* (Paris: Les Éditions du Cerf, 1947), pp. 21 f. Abbé Remillieux recounted the incident to me last summer with understandable enthusiasm when I was visiting his parish.

the midst of the congregation. The prayers at the foot of the altar are said in dialogue with the congregation. The Introit, Gradual, and other proper chants are sung *recto tono* by the whole congregation while the ordinary chants, *Kyrie, Gloria,* and so on, are sung in Gregorian, again by all those present. The Collects, Epistle, and Gospel are translated and Abbé Remillieux adds a few words of explanation. There is an offertory procession. The Canon is read in a low tone, but loud enough to be followed in a Missal. At each *Memento* the celebrant pauses and those of the congregation who wish to, mention their intentions aloud. The *Confiteor* and *Misereatur* are omitted before the Communion. As the priest leaves the altar saying the Last Gospel (This is characteristic of the Lyonese Rite) the congregation sings the *Laudate.* I assisted at this Mass one Sunday last summer and found it very impressive.[9]

Still more radical changes are introduced into some of the Masses celebrated by the priests of the *Mission de France.* I had the privilege of assisting at such a Mass celebrated one evening at about eight o'clock in a private house in a working-class district on the outskirts of Paris. The celebrant was a former priest-workman, now devoting full time to apostolic work, but otherwise continuing, as far as possible, to follow the customs of working-class life. The kitchen table was moved into the living room and served as an altar. Some thirty people were crowded into the room; apparently somewhat more than half were workingmen, the balance being visitors or volunteers from other social classes assisting in the work. The Canon (*Sanctus* to *Pater Noster* exclusive) and some of the Offertory prayers were said in Latin. The rest of the Mass was said in French, rather freely translated. Mass was *coram populo.* The celebrant interrupted Mass after the Introit to explain the apparently vindictive nature of the text (. . . *vindica sanguinem Sanctorum tuorum*). Instead of a sermon, there was a lively discussion of the lessons of the day's liturgy, with questions from the congregation and answers by the priest. Several of those present mentioned their intentions aloud at each *Memento.* The greater part of the congregation received Communion. Immediately after Mass the table was restored to its place in the kitchen and several of the persons present joined the priest in a late supper.

[9] Chery, *op. cit.*, pp. 59-64, gives a more complete description of this Mass and of the thought behind it.

It is obvious that most of the features mentioned in the last two paragraphs are innovations which could not be introduced without extraordinary permissions. Even if such permissions were forthcoming, it is questionable whether such innovations are to be desired. Many may feel, like the present writer, that world-wide uniformity of the Roman Rite is a concrete sign of the Church's unity too precious to be sacrificed. Nevertheless the work of Abbé Remillieux and the priests of the *Mission de France* are a valuable example to us at least in this sense that they may stimulate us to seek ways and means to make the Holy Sacrifice more intelligible to the people and to secure their more intimate participation in it. The subject has too many facets to permit discussion here; but one question here may be raised by way of example. How many of us have forgotten that pastors and others having the care of souls are directly ordered by the Council of Trent (*mandat sancta Synodus*) to explain frequently, personally or by others, during Mass some of the sacred texts and something of the mystery of the Holy Sacrifice, especially on Sundays and feasts?[10]

If the liturgy is not the proper place for innovations, we have a freer hand in what the French call *la para-liturgie*. By this term is to be understood those ceremonies, not strictly liturgical, which take place in the church or in close connection with it. The thing, if not the term, is familiar to us. For instance, a May procession or the devotion of the Three Hours on Good Friday would belong in this category. Some priests, Abbé Michonneau for example, have made a wide use of paraliturgical functions. We read of special ceremonies of this sort at Christmas, Easter, or even on Mother's Day and of didactic ceremonies to familiarize the people with the Gospels, the missions, the apostolate and so on. Functions of this sort, arranged to be readily intelligible, can have a real missionary value as well as a value for the instruction of the faithful.

If a priest regards his parish as a missionary parish and makes the missionary motive the keynote of his work, what effect will it have on his own personal spiritual life? Abbé Michonneau answers with great emphasis that it will have a very good effect indeed. He goes further. He argues that the spirit of the apostolate pertains to the very essence of the diocesan priesthood. It is therefore not

[10] Cf. *DB*, 946.

enough to be exact in one's spiritual exercises and to be circumspect, prudent, and reserved.

How can we call one who lacks the passion for souls a "good priest" or a "holy priest" simply because he is regular, punctual and because he judges all things with a soothing tone, going so far as to soothe in himself problems which should torture him and keep him awake nights? It is not his spiritual life which makes him so, but an impoverished spiritual life, one without depth, where the *Caritas Christi urget nos* has no place, a spiritual life which is not *priestly*.[11]

On the other hand, the priest who is constantly driven by a love for souls is simply being faithful to the spirit of his priesthood. The bulk of his work is directly concerned with souls. He is always seeking out those whom he may bring to Christ and, because the center of his interest is here, his own spiritual life benefits. This does not mean that one should undervalue the exercises of piety; rather, it means that these exercises take on a new meaning and a new value. We have often admired the apostolic spirit of enthusiastic lay people; we have seen its effect on their own lives. Why not apply the same lesson to ourselves?

We congratulate ourselves on the zeal of certain lay *militants*. With tears in our eyes we hear the story of the fine acts of our young people, personal conquests, a minute of silence won on Good Friday in the midst of the factory. We admire these young people. Shall we, then, be less daring, less capable of placing before men the august figure of the Master? Let us admit that often our lay people can give us points, that they know better than we how to warm souls by their contact. Why, unless it is that their spirituality carries them on to these things and ours is insufficient?[12]

The present brief article is merely enough to give some hint of the new spirit which is transforming a number of French parishes. The movement has countless ramifications which have necessarily been passed over. Enough has been said merely to outline the general point of view. It all stems from the realization that France is, in a certain very real sense, a missionary country and that this fact demands a considerable reorganization of spirit and methods. Possibly this French current of thought has its lessons for us in

[11] Michonneau, *op. cit.*, p. 397.

[12] *Ibid.*, p. 394.

the United States. If we recognize the essentially missionary character of our own situation we may be forced into lines of thought and action which may prove profitable.

PAUL HANLY FURFEY

The Catholic University of America
Washington, D. C.

FIFTY YEARS AGO

In *The American Ecclesiastical Review* for January, 1899, the leading article, by Fr. P. De Roo, of Centreville, Oregon, is entitled "The Apostle St. Thomas in America." The author believes it is not impossible that St. Thomas reached South America and there preached the Gospel. "The belief that some of the apostles, most likely St. Thomas, penetrated as far as America in the desire to propagate the teaching of Jesus Christ is not devoid of foundation. . . . The old American traditions, so singularly consistent by their agreement, whilst originating in many different parts of this extensive continent, cannot be wholly overlooked by the serious student". . . . Fr. H. Thurston, S.J., writing on "Christmas and the Christmas Calendar," asserts that "down to the middle of the seventh century it was not the 25th of December but the 6th of January which was kept in Jerusalem as the annual commemoration of the Nativity". . . . This issue contains the notice of the death of the celebrated theologian, Fr. Sabetti, S.J., with the statement: "No single man gave more whole-hearted encouragement than Father Sabetti to the *Review* in the earlier periods of its growth, when there was still doubt whether it could survive". . . . In the Conference section we read that the *Memorare* was written, not by St. Bernard, but by a French priest of the seventeenth century, Fr. Claude Bernard, who was later confounded with the Saint of Clairvaux in the matter of the authorship of this popular prayer to Our Lady. . . . The law of the Church regarding the right of a religious to approach a confessor different from the one appointed for the community is thus expounded: "Any religious may, for special and grave reasons, request the superior to grant her leave to consult a confessor different from the one who is appointed for the community." [It is interesting to note how much more lenient is the present law in this matter, requiring no permission of the superior and setting down as the justifying reason *quies conscientiae,* which can be very generously interpreted].

F.J.C.

OPINIONS CONCERNING DOCTRINAL DEVELOPMENT

"The classical theologians have powerfully systematized certain portions of dogmatic theology: such as for example, the beautiful constructions of Father Billot upon the Trinity, the Incarnate Word, and Grace. . . . But they have too much neglected the fundamental conceptions of revelation and of faith."

This remark of Fr. Lebreton has been reproduced by Fr. Henri De Lubac in a recent article.[1] If the masters of theological teaching have neglected, as Fr. Lebreton says they have, the great formal categories of sacred science, then those who have studied the masters are certainly in no better case. The priest who has studied his theology knows, to be sure, the major dogmatic theses and the relations of the theses to one another. But he is much less certain when there is question of the foundations of sacred science itself: of the relations between revelation and dogma, for example, and between dogma and theology, and the precise nature of the theological process. Does the term "virtual revelation" convey clear meaning to him?—or the assertion of St. Thomas that the subject matter of theology comprises not merely "omnia revelata" but "omnia revelabilia"?[2] More's the pity if these basic notions are vague, since they describe to us the actual subject matter, the "formal object" of the science.

A problem which perhaps as much as any other has been left in the shade is that of doctrinal development. The problem is to discover how it is possible for the Church to propose as divinely revealed doctrines which did not enter into the explicit content of the apostolic teaching; and at the same time remain faithful to its fundamental premise of a deposit of revelation which was completed in apostolic times, and which is not susceptible of any increase. The purpose of this article will be first to outline the problem; then to set down the starting point from which all discussion of it should begin; and finally to discuss and criticize briefly two rather opposed theories of development.

[1] H. De Lubac, S.J., "Le problème du développement du dogme," *Recherches de Science Religieuse*, XXXV (1948), 130-150, 153.

[2] *Sum. Theol.*, I, q. 1, a. 3.

"God, who at sundry times and in divers manners spoke in times past to the fathers by the prophets, last of all in these days has spoken to us by his Son, whom he appointed heir of all things, by whom also he made the world." [3]

Thus, inaugurating the Epistle to the Hebrews, St. Paul sketches in a few words the history of the Christian revelation. First there was the ancient revelation, the "law and the prophets," given by God over a period of centuries to the patriarchs and prophets of the Old Testament, prophetic of Christ, and finding its complete fulfillment and its terminus in Him. Then the complete and definitive revelation of the New Testament, made to the Apostles by the Incarnate Word Himself, and after His Ascension into heaven, carried on by the Holy Spirit as long as there was on earth a living Apostle to listen to His voice.[4] It is a history of God teaching mankind about Himself over a span of thousands of years—not continuously, but as it were sporadically, as it pleased Him to teach us. One thing is certain: that the period of God's public revelation to the world ended with the death of St. John, the "Ancient," who lived out almost the entire first Christian century at Ephesus.

Some of God's public revelation was written down in sacred books inspired by God, the Old and New Testaments of the Bible. Some of it was not written down in inspired books, but is contained in the divine and apostolic Tradition. The best source we have to help us learn the content of the divine and apostolic Tradition is the consent of the Fathers of the Church, speaking not so much as theologians, but as Bishops, guardians of the deposit and witnesses to the Faith, saying that such or such an article is part of the teaching which has come from God. But the divine and apostolic Tradition is not merely a matter of intellectual teaching: it is a compound of "assertions, institutions, religious practices"; [5] it is found as much in what the first Christians did as in what they said; it is found above all in their worship and their prayer.

Our knowledge of the Tradition does not depend on friendly witnesses entirely. If the pro-consul Pliny writes an official letter to his emperor, Trajan, in the second Christian century, telling him

[3] *Heb.* 1:1-2.

[4] *John*, 16:13.

[5] A. Gardeil, O.P., *Le donné révélé et la théologie*, Juvisy: Editions du Cerf, 1932, p. 151.

that the Christians of Asia Minor have a custom of assembling periodically in the early morning, and singing a hymn to Christ, "as to a God," this fact is carefully noted down, and is added on to other evidence—itself partly traditional and partly scriptural—that the early Christians believed in the divinity of Christ. Cardinal Newman has described the Tradition as "partly the interpretation, partly the supplement of Scripture, partly preserved in intellectual expressions, partly latent in the spirit and temper of Christians; poured to and fro in closets and upon the housetops, in liturgies, in controversial works, in obscure fragments, in sermons, in popular prejudices, in local customs." [6]

This is the deposit, then, the inspired Scriptures and a Tradition which has come from God. Not a "clerical" tradition, it must be noted, not confined to the theological and polemical writings of divines, though these have their part in it, but a popular and as it were informal source of divine truth, found as much in the words and deeds of the poor and lowly as in the writings of the sages. This is the deposit which Christ handed on to the Apostles, and which must be faithfully preserved.

Now, the fact stands that in the course of the centuries the Church has given expression to this fundamental deposit in the form of doctrinal teachings which are notably different from the expressions found in Scripture and in the earliest traditional documents. These differences are found not only in the formulas by which the revealed truths are expressed (for example, in the adoption of the abstract term "Trinity" to express the concrete trinitarian revelation in the Gospel); but even the subject matter is different, in part at least. The Church defines as divinely revealed, and imposes on the faith of the people, affirmations which did not enter into the explicit belief of the first Christians, doctrines which they seem not even to have foreseen.

For example, the doctrines of Purgatory, of papal infallibility, of the efficacy of the sacraments, of the intellectual soul as *per se* the form of the body, of the Immaculate Conception, of the institution by Jesus Christ of seven sacraments—where will we find clear and unequivocal expressions of these beliefs in the primitive

[6] J. H. Newman, *An Essay on the Development of Christian Doctrine,* London: Longmans, Green and Co., 1888, p. 76.

Church? The few and inconclusive Scriptural texts which may be applied to Purgatory give us some warranty for the existence of an intermediate state after death,[7] and the practice of the early Christians of praying and offering sacrifices for the dead is evidence that the belief was traditional; but it cannot be said that the existence of Purgatory is to be found explicitly in revelation. And so it is with papal infallibility. The great passages in St. Matthew and St. John, and the early traditional doctrines and practices of, let us say, St. Clement and St. Irenaeus, point undeniably to the fact of a universal teaching authority residing in the See of Rome; but it cannot be claimed that the precise modality of doctrinal infallibility is to be found in these passages.[8]

Thus it is clear that there has been progress, development, in the dogmatic teaching of the Church, not merely in precision of terms, but in actual content and subject matter. Doctrines are taught today as divinely revealed which were not explicitly taught a hundred years ago; and after the Council of Trent a whole galaxy of truths entered into the dogmatic teaching of the Church, proposed to the faith of Catholics not as new doctrines, but as contained in the ancient deposit.

Many of these truths proposed explicitly today as divinely revealed were unknown to the first Christians. Fr. De Lubac rejects the opinion of one theologian that the Apostles could well have taught to their successors truths such as that of the Immaculate Conception, and other similar doctrines. He writes: "But is it necessary to insist on the extremely unrealistic character, not to say more, of such an hypothesis? How could the Apostles have enunciated for themselves truths whose formulation supposes in certain cases all sorts of notions and habits of thought of later times? How then to explain their refusal, or their neglect, to transmit them? Or if they did transmit them, what are we to think of the deluge of forgetfulness which suddenly swamped the second Christian century?" [9]

Modern rationalists and agnostics explain the undeniable fact of doctrinal development as an expression of the growth of the

[7] *II Macc.* 12:43; *Matt.* 12:32; *I Cor.* 3:10-19; *Apoc.* 21:27.

[8] Gardeil, *op. cit.*, p. 179.

[9] *Op. cit.*, pp. 152 f.

Christian myth. Protestants explain it as doctrinal corruption, a body of ecclesiastical teachings added on to, and adulterating, the primitive simplicity of the Gospel message. All Catholics, however they may disagree in explaining the fact, hold that the progress is not to be found in the revealed truth itself, because revelation closed in the first Christian century; nor is there any addition; but only a progress in our understanding and penetration and possession of the truths contained in the original deposit itself.

Certainly the finest treatment of the subject in English, and one of the finest in any language, is that of Cardinal Newman.[10] Fr. Gardeil commends Newman for bringing to light "certain points which appear decisive and which will remain always as models of a work well done."[11] But at the same time he criticizes Newman for depending excessively on the analogy of the seed which grows into the flourishing tree. This analogy, says Gardeil, is well chosen to bring out the consistency of developments—for whatever is in the tree was in the seed—but he objects that it is only an analogy after all, and is subject to its own limitations. The seed grows from powers which are wholly intrinsic, while it cannot be denied that doctrinal developments are attributable to extrinsic factors, the initiative of the human mind led by the Spirit of God—factors extrinsic to dogma itself.

This criticism seems unjustified, since Newman shows little, if any, dependence on the analogy of organic growth; and also because he himself stresses the importance of the same extrinsic factors insisted upon by Gardeil.

> Moreover, a development will have this characteristic, that, its action being in the busy scene of human life, it cannot progress at all without cutting across, and thereby destroying or modifying and incorporating within itself existing modes of thinking and operating. The development then of an idea is not like an investigation worked out on paper,

---

[10] An observation of Fr. De Lubac may possibly reflect the continental theologian's view of Newman's proper place. He writes (*op. cit.*, p. 130) concerning the unusual views of a Belgian theologian: "His victims were not only heterodox thinkers, nor even such *Catholic authors* as Blondel and Newman. But they were also the *two theologians* who have treated *ex professo* of the matter with the greatest authority, Fathers Grandmaison and Gardeil" (italics added).

[11] Gardeil, *op. cit.*, p. 155.

in which each successive advance is a pure evolution from a foregoing, but it is carried on through and by means of communities of men and their leaders and guides; and it employs their minds as its instruments, and depends upon them, while it uses them.[12]

It must be admitted that the explanation of the development of dogma is difficult and complex, and that Catholic authors are not at all in agreement over it. Fr. De Lubac, for example, in his article often cited here, criticizes practically all of them. But in a simple and introductory study such as this, two considerations seem to be demanded: first, that of the unfathomable riches of the Christian revelation as the inevitable starting point of any theory of development, and then of doctrinal development as the inevitably gradual process of articulating, of "minting" this treasure, to use the phrase of Fr. De Lubac, a process which uses the best thought and intuition of the whole Church, and which is ultimately guaranteed by definition under the guidance and protection of the Holy Spirit.

All theories of development must, it seems, begin with this idea of the inexhaustible riches of the divine revelation given to the world by Christ. Both Newman and Gardeil, with certain differences of outlook, make it the starting point of their theories.

For Newman, a great and leading idea, capable of profoundly influencing the thought and action of men, cannot be grasped all at once, from its first expression; but must be analyzed, sifted, penetrated, compared and contrasted with other ideas, its genuine implications recognized and followed up and false connections rejected; great ideas must in other words develop. Now Christianity is an idea which bears all the signs of greatness. It has powerfully influenced the world since its first appearance, and like all great ideas is subject to the law of development. The view on which his book is based is

> that, from the nature of the human mind, time is necessary for the full comprehension and perfection of great ideas; and that the highest and most wonderful truths, though communicated to the world once for all by inspired teachers, could not be comprehended all at once by the recipients, but, as being received and transmitted by minds not inspired and through media which were human, have required only the longer

[12] Newman, *op. cit.*, p. 38.

time and deeper thought for their full elucidation. This may be called the "Theory of the Development of Doctrine." [13]

Thus Newman begins, we may say, from the *intrinsic* capacity of a great idea of development, though as we have seen, he does not hold this process to begin and go on automatically from within, but needs the extrinsic factor of human thought. The substance of his book consists in the establishment of seven tests, or canons, of genuine development, as distinguished from doctrinal corruption, and the application of these tests with great erudition to certain Christian dogmas.

Fr. Gardeil begins, not so much from the intrinsic capacity of ideas to develop as from the analysis of the process by which the mind acquires and stabilizes scientific knowledge. All sciences, says Fr. Gardeil, begin with a "global intuition," a whole view, complete but inarticulate, of a single great and all-inclusive object; and scientific progress consists in a progressively clearer and more distinct knowledge of this object in detail.

> Both scientific development and dogmatic development find their justification in that most profound law which obliges all human activity in the sphere of intelligence to be only a penetration (*approfondissement*) of a primary and intelligible datum. . . . The work of the human mind is conceived as an incessant attempt at contact, in affirmation of detail, with a primitive datum.[14]

For Newman, then, the "idea" of Christianity, and for Gardeil, the "global object of faith", must develop, or be developed. And here we must turn to a clarification emphatically insisted upon by Fr. De Lubac, though it is to be found perhaps less emphatically in each of the others. This "idea" is not an idea at all, in the sense of a philosophical concept, nor is it a mere "object" of scientific knowledge. It is a Person, Jesus Christ, and all doctrinal development consists in the effort of the human mind—aided ultimately by the Spirit of God—to gain ever clearer and more articulate knowledge of the unfathomable riches of Christ.

Fr. De Lubac insists that the starting point of all of our thinking about development must be the thought of Christ. In Him is contained the whole of dogma.

[13] *Ibid.*, pp. 30 f.

[14] Gardeil, *op. cit.*, pp. 162 f.

In reality, concretely, that which is first and from which it is necessary to start without ever quitting it—that which is first and last—is the redemptive Action; it is the gift which God has made to us of Himself in His Son; it is the definitive realization of the great design hidden in Himself and now revealed, "our gratuitous vocation to eternal life through Christ and in Christ, or in other words, Christ, the plenitude of the gift of God, and the unique source for men of eternal salvation." And it is at the same time the revelation of this. Because it is all this which is revealed to us in Jesus Christ. It is all this which at first undivided, forms the global object, the incredibly rich object of revelation. We can call it, to use an equivalent expression, "the whole of dogma." And this "whole of dogma" is not, as its name indicates, susceptible of any increase. It also, like the whole of the redemptive action, is at the same time first and last. It is impossible to go beyond it.[15]

Jesus Christ is presented to us as the whole of dogma, as the sum total of religious knowledge, in the opening words of St. John's first Epistle:

I write of what was from the beginning, what we have heard, what we have seen with our eyes, what we have looked upon and our hands have handled: of the Word of Life. And the life was made known and we have seen, and now testify and announce to you, the Life eternal, which was with the Father, and has appeared to us.

The thought of the inexhaustible riches of Christ as the total object of our knowledge is to be found in Newman and Gardeil.[16] These riches include the majestically simple utterances, the parables, the miracles which are closely connected with the teachings, the ritualistic gestures, the concrete affirmations which contain realities of immense significance: "This is my Body," "Thou art Peter and upon this rock I will build my Church." And along with the sublime profundity of the object of our faith, and because of it, there arise the inevitable obscurities that must attend the entrance into the world of eternally hidden truths—obscurities in matters of detail.

To understand Christ, then, to clarify the great primary object, to remove the obscurities in matter of detail, this is the beginning and the end of Christian knowledge and the profound cause of doc-

[15] De Lubac, *op. cit.*, p. 156.

[16] Cf. Newman, *op. cit.*, pp. 53; 66f; Gardeil, *op. cit.*, pp. 164 ff.

trinal development. It involves "the entry into play, under the government of the Spirit of God, of an autonomous force, the human mind itself, which through the total intuition of the faith committed to it, finds itself in possession of the riches of revelation, as yet unexplored in detail, and which seeks to take integral possession of these riches." [17]

Beginning from this starting point, theologians attempt to explain the process of doctrinal development. In attempting this explanation, they must safeguard the definitive character of revelation, completed upon the death of the last Apostle, and must at the same time acknowledge a genuine increase in the subject matter of doctrines presented to the faithful as divinely revealed and therefore as pertaining to the object of faith.

There can be no question of the Church receiving a new revelation since apostolic times, and then defining the subject matter of this new revelation—this of course is excluded. Nor is the problem solved by the assertion that all definitions are simply restatements in terms of common sense—or of a developed philosophy of common sense—of truths which are presented concretely in the sources of revelation. For example, consider the adoption of the word "Trinity" to represent the reality of God's intimate life, and of the term "Hypostatic Union" to denote the relation of the two natures of Christ to each other in His unique divine Person. These are not developments, really, but restatements. The Apostles and their converts adored the Trinity, and acknowledged the union of the two natures in Christ, even though they did not know the terms which have become so meaningful for us.

In a genuine development, a doctrine is presented by the Church as pertaining to faith which did not enter into the explicit faith of Christians of earlier times, perhaps a truth which did not even occur to them. Or again, a truth which was not universally accepted, but which was thought to lie in the area of free theological disputation, is later taken out of that area and formally recognized as part of the original deposit.

In their attempts to explain this phenomenon of a growth in our knowledge of the revealed object without any corresponding growth in the content of the object—and of course without "extrinsicism"

[17] Gardeil, *op. cit.*, p. 167

or addition—theologians seem to adopt one or the other of two lines of thought.

The first group would ascribe dogmatic development exclusively, or nearly exclusively, to processes which are strictly those of dialectical and scientific theology. It is the theologians who are responsible for dogmatic development, through their patient and precise efforts, following logical and rational procedures, drawing out of the revealed object all of the truths which are implied in it. The conclusions to which this process leads them may seem at first, to themselves and to others, to be merely "theological"—that is, not pertaining to faith, since they involve a human factor, a rational process, while faith is not discursive, but is wholly divine in motive and object. But from time to time the authority of the Church, as infallible teacher, will recognize that certain of their conclusions may contain more than appeared at first sight, may contain a statement of an important revealed truth clearer than any previous formulation. Then the Church may define that this truth, arrived at by way of a theological conclusion, is contained in Scripture and Tradition, that it pertains to the order of faith and not merely that of theology; and may thus "elevate" the conclusion into a dogma of faith. It is not the conclusion which is defined as such, but the revealed truth, though it was discovered by way of a conclusion. For those who think in this manner, doctrinal development is almost if not entirely attributable to the theological process.

The other group, however, while recognizing the *contribution* of the theologians to the development of dogma, attribute the process in its entirety to a factor much wider and more inclusive, which may be described as a growth in the collective Christian consciousness, a progress of the whole Church—not just of theologians—in the knowledge of revealed truth. It is true that certain doctrines which have been defined as dogmas may at first have appeared as theological conclusions, but this is not the only way in which dogma develops. Indeed, some dogmas would not have qualified as "certain", but as merely "probable," if they had remained in the area of theology; while other theological conclusions, of the highest certitude in theology, and of the first importance, have never been defined as dogmas.

Fr. De Lubac sharply criticizes the theologians of the first group, those who would limit dogmatic development to the area of the

logical processes of theological deduction. He turns his fire first upon what may be the most extravagant of all expressions of this position: namely the thesis of a certain theologian that all theological conclusions are definable as such, and that only theological conclusions are definable. The theologian who maintained this opinion held that the doctrines of almost all the articles of the *Summa* are capable of constituting new dogmas.[18]

This extreme position, says Fr. De Lubac, was not taken seriously by any of the theologians who reviewed the work in which it appeared. He cites the comment of Fr. Gardeil, "an indefinite extension of the definable . . . a beautiful case of theologism." But Fr. De Lubac continues by saying he is surprised to see substantially the same opinion expressed, though not so extravagantly, by a theologian of such reputable standing as Fr. Boyer.[19] He cites Fr. Boyer as saying:

> I do not see how one can deny the logical bond, which not only exists in itself but is also knowable by our means of investigation, between the progressive precision of dogma and the great indetermination of its origins. The development of a truth cannot but follow a logic, and this process, at least at the point of arrival, must be capable of being perceived. To appeal to "life," and in some way to irrational factors—*quoad nos*—appears to us as a concession to certain contemporary philosophies.[20]

Fr. Boyer takes as an example the dogma of the Immaculate Conception, one of those least explicit in the sources, and claims to see "quite sufficiently how it flows out of the proto-evangelium."

Fr. De Lubac criticizes Fr. Boyer's opinion as lacking conformity to the facts, as imprudent, and as lacking in respect for the independence of the Church in its dogmatic judgments. "Doubtless," he says, "theologians have their role, and a very important one. The Church uses them, it is attentive to their opinions . . . but while it consults theologians, it judges them, it controls them. It is not bound by the reasons which they bring forward. . . . What the

[18] De Lubac, *op. cit.*, p. 130.

[19] C. Boyer, S.J., "Qu'est-ce que la théologie? Réflexions sur une controverse," *Gregorianum*, XXI (1940), a volume which Fr. De Lubac says did not reach France until 1946.

[20] De Lubac, *op. cit.*, p. 137.

Church is looking for is not whether such a proposition is or is not correctly deduced, but whether it is or is not contained in the faith.[21] And to determine this, he says, the Church "examines its conscience." [22]

One of the leading expressions of the theory that doctrinal developments represent a growth in the collective Catholic consciousness of the faith, is that of Fr. Gardeil. His problem is to discover how a truth, arrived at by way of theological reasoning, can get up above the field of human logic and enter into the domain of faith. He finds that the "terrain" upon which this juncture can be effected is that of "the living and socialized faith of the Catholic Church, I mean the entire Church, teaching and taught." [23] It is faith, he says, which has received the deposit, which guards it, and which uses theology to penetrate it. He acknowledges that to co-operate in doctrinal development theological arguments must have intrinsic value; but he holds that this intrinsic value of scientific evidence "will be less appreciated for itself than for the unanimity of assent to it, the collective tendency towards a new formula. . . . What is efficacious in bringing about a dogma is less a rigorous theological systematization than a theology commonly received." [24] No process of theological reasoning, however solid, will give rise to a dogmatic development unless there takes place an orientation of the "common theology" towards its conclusion, "a tendency ever more general, constant, and firm, whatever may be the divisions of theologians and systems." [25]

Like Fr. Boyer, Fr. Gardeil uses the example of the Immaculate Conception, but with an entirely different significance. As a theological conclusion, this thesis was rejected by the greatest minds of the Middle Ages. The theological argument of Scotus in its favor was hardly more than an argument of fitness, and achieved no higher status than that of probability. But no matter.

A light which neither St. Bernard nor St. Thomas had seen filtered through the conclusion of this argument, so aleatory as we may esteem it to be. The piety and faith in the Immaculate which sought an issue

---

[21] *Ibid.*, p. 145.
[22] *Ibid.*
[23] Gardeil, *op. cit.*, p. 175.
[24] *Ibid.*
[25] *Ibid.*

have found it. . . . The latent common faith recognizes itself in this idea; and little by little it becomes the received theology, *recepta*.[26]

The definition of the dogma then appears as the sanction and infallible seal of the teaching Church upon this article which was at first hidden in the common faith, and came only gradually to consciousness. And the Holy Spirit is seen at every stage of the development: in the common and unformed belief, in the thought of Scotus, in the rallying of the Universities and the nations, in the pious desires of the faithful throughout the world, and in the final definition itself.

This theory of Fr. Gardeil (it seems also to represent the line of thought of Fathers De Lubac, Grandmaison,[27] and Simonin[28]) appears better suited to the concept of Tradition outlined at the beginning of this article than the other opinion which would limit dogmatic development to the area of theological reasoning. From the beginning, the genuine Tradition did not depend exclusively upon the writings of savants, but was found as well more informally in the practices and customs, and in the worship and prayer of the people. So for the full unfolding of the Tradition the same factors over and above theological argumentation are called into play, but subject entirely to the final judgment of the magisterium. True, the theory will have to meet the objection raised by Fr. Boyer, that it introduces vitalism and irrational elements into Catholic teaching. Fr. Gardeil admits that his concept is not merely intellectual, that it calls upon elements of the emotional and even of the artistic order, but he denies that his theory involves some sort of "divining" faculty which escapes the control of the intelligence. He was a staunch advocate of the primacy of the intelligence in matters of faith, as all who read him know, but here he says, "It is not the deductive intelligence which is utilized so much as the intuitive intelligence."[29] It is a matter of the *sensus Catholicus*, which is perhaps a term descriptive of the divine and apostolic Tradition.

[26] *Ibid.*, p. 177.

[27] De Grandmaison, "Le développement du Dogme chrétien," *Revue pratique d'apologetique*, VI (1908); *Le Dogme chrétien*, Paris, 1928.

[28] H. D. Simonin, O.P., "'Implicite' et 'explicite' dans le développement du dogme," *Angelicum*, XIV (1937).

[29] Gardeil, *op. cit.*, p. 186.

Here the thought of Fr. Gardeil and that of Fr. De Lubac seem to join (though Fr. De Lubac insists that he puts forth no theory himself). He thinks that certain theologians have confused the issue by tending to view doctrinal development only in connection with the problem of the definability of theological conclusions, while in fact the problem is much broader and more inclusive. They seem to view the revealed deposit as comprising a number of propositions explicitly revealed, and the development of dogma as a process of drawing out and articulating what is implied in these propositions. The reality of the matter is the other way around: the "implicit" is not contained in the "explicit," but it is the "explicit" which is contained in the "implicit"—in Jesus Christ our Redeemer, who is the whole of dogma. For Fr. De Lubac, this is the first truth, that in Jesus Christ all has been given to us, all at once, the gift and the revelation; and consequently all explanations, whatever be their tenor, and whatever be their mode, will never be any more than the minting in small coins of a treasure already possessed whole and entire." [30]

CHARLES E. SHEEDY, C.S.C.

University of Notre Dame
Notre Dame, Indiana

[30] De Lubac, *op. cit.*, p. 157.

THE IMPACT OF OUR LORD'S PERSONALITY

The Divine Personality of Our Blessed Lord so impressed itself upon the men of His days that they were moved either to love Him or to hate Him. They could not ignore Him, much as some of them would have liked to. They made as if to treat Him with contempt: witness their endeavours to hold Him up to ridicule. But they could not hide the underlying respect which His Divine Personality demands. Behind the veil of His human nature lay all the splendour of the Godhead, and because of that, all men must needs reckon with Him.

—C. J. Woolen, in *Christ in His Mystical Body* (Westminster, Maryland: The Newman Bookshop, 1948), p. 47.

MIXED MARRIAGES IN 1947

Twenty-six per cent of all marriages performed "in the Catholic Church" in 1947 in the United States were mixed marriages. This conclusion emerges from a study of the figures presented in the diocesan summaries published in the 1948 edition of *The Catholic Directory*. Before going on to further analysis, we must explain why this percentage is in sharp contrast with that given by Dr. Clement S. Mihanovich for the year 1946 in his article in the July, 1948, issue of this *Review*.

The divergence is not due to any fault on the Dr. Mihanovich's part in the computation of the individual diocesan percentages but in the method he employed to arrive at regional and area averages, and lastly in computing the "national average." To get the averages of more-than-one-diocese units, Dr. Mihanovich tells us that he added up the percentages of the dioceses in the larger units and divided by the number of dioceses. The "national average" he presented, 40.2 per cent, is simply the average of the averages thus obtained for the North, the South and the West.

Now, the fault in this method is that it gives equal weight to all dioceses in a region regardless of their respective sizes and to all three regions, which are even more disparate in their comparative number of marriages. When the matter was brought to his attention, Dr. Mihanovich graciously admitted the invalidity of this method.

By the more accurate method of adding up all the figures for mixed marriages given in each archdiocesan and diocesan report, we find that there were 92,329 mixed marriages out of a total of 324,195 marriages performed "by the priest" in 1946. These totals exclude the four dioceses which did not report the number of mixed marriages: Boston, Fall River, Honolulu, and Tucson. The truer percentage of mixed marriages, then in the United States in 1946 was 28.5 per cent.

The main purpose in making this correction was to compare the data for 1946 with that for 1947. For in the latter year there was a total of 102,624 mixed marriages in this country out of a total of 393,577 marriages "in the Church," or a percentage of 26.07 per cent. This computation included the three dioceses

of Boston, Fall River, and Tucson, but excluded Honolulu, since the latter is not a part of the continental United States. If we were able to add the figures for the former three dioceses to our 1946 data, the average of mixed marriages for the country as a whole in that year would stand a bit lower. Comparing 1946's average of 28.5 with that of 26.07 for 1947, we surmise that, in the matter of mixed marriages, the Church in this country is not faced with any trend, but with a situation.

The static nature of the mixed-marriage picture is emphasized by a comparison of the individual diocesan percentages for these two years. Of the 116 archdioceses and dioceses for which comparison is possible, we find that the large majority of them, 80 to be exact, vary by only three per cent or less in these two years. Forty-four differed by less than 1.5 per cent and 17 by less than one-half of one per cent. Nineteen of the diocesan mixed-marriage percentages increased or decreased between 1946 and 1947 by more than three and less than five per cent. Only seventeen showed a divergence of more than five per cent and of these only four showed more than ten per cent. They were Albany and Dubuque with a change of 11.7 per cent; Belmont Abbey, an increase of 11.1 per cent; and Lafayette, Indiana, a decrease of 19.3 per cent.

Some idea of the general mixed-marriage situation may be gained from the following table (Table A). In it, the region called East includes the New England and the Middle Atlantic States; the North Central, those of the Middle West, usually divided into the East North Central and the West North Central; the South extends from the Mason-Dixon line to the western border of Texas; the West embraces the Mountain and the Pacific States.

TABLE A—MIXED MARRIAGE RATES FOR 1947 BY REGIONS

Region	Mixed marriages	Total marriages	% of mixed marriages
East	38,610	182,005	21.2
North Central	34,650	127,415	27.19
South	17,051	44,944	37.94
West	11,732	32,195	36.44
United States	**102,624**	393,577	**26.07**

It is evident how the Eastern Region, in which 46 per cent, or almost half, of the marriages of Catholics "in the Church" takes

place, helps keep the national average down to 26 per cent. However, it is interesting to note that the diocese with the lowest percentage of mixed marriages is that of the Pittsburgh Greek Rite, which is not territorial, it is true, but confined mostly to the Eastern States. The other three dioceses with percentages below 10 per cent are Corpus Christi, El Paso and Santa Fe, all in the Southwest.

In Table B we spread the canvas out in its entirety to look at the averages for all the archdioceses and dioceses. In this Table, they have been grouped in Provinces and presented in the alphabetical order of their Metropolitan See.

TABLE B—MIXED MARRIAGES IN AMERICAN ARCHDIOCESES AND DIOCESES IN 1947, ARRANGED BY PROVINCES.

Diocese	Mixed marriages	Total marriages	% of mixed marriages
Baltimore	2,636	5,680	48.
Belmont Abbey	7	7	100.
Charleston	284	392	72.4
Raleigh	331	471	70.3
Richmond	948	1,516	62.5
St. Augustine	762	1,588	47.9
Savannah-Atlanta	406	592	68.5
Wheeling	597	1,372	43.5
Wilmington	364	929	39.2
Province total	**6,335**	**12,547**	**50.5**
Boston	3,537	17,713	20.
Burlington	500	1,591	31.4
Fall River	505	3,562	14.2
Hartford	2,378	6,274	37.9
Manchester	833	3,267	25.5
Portland, Maine	455	3,811	11.9
Providence	914	5,900	15.5
Springfield, Mass.	1,391	6,708	20.7
Province total	**10,513**	**48,826**	**21.2**
Chicago	4,486	22,394	20.
Belleville	359	1,188	30.2
Peoria	1,111	2,695	41.2
Rockford	468	1,328	35.2
Springfield, Ill.	323	795	40.6
Province total	**6,747**	**28,400**	**23.8**

Diocese	Mixed marriages	Total marriages	% of mixed marriages
Cincinnati	1,548	4,358	35.5
Cleveland	1,817	8,348	21.8
Columbus	715	1,514	47.2
Steubenville	303	831	41.3
Toledo	1,046	3,130	34.
Youngstown	857	3,123	37.8
Province total	**6,286**	**21,304**	**29.5**
Denver	690	1,919	35.9
Cheyenne	148	381	38.8
Pueblo	149	878	17.
Province total	**987**	**3,178**	**31.5**
Detroit	3,627	16,218	22.3
Grand Rapids	567	1,839	31.
Lansing	601	1,916	31.4
Marquette	438	1,665	26.3
Saginaw	422	1,774	23.7
Province total	**5,655**	**23,412**	**24.1**
Dubuque	431	2,246	19.
Davenport	492	1,184	41.5
Des Moines	180	450	40.
Sioux City	351	1,361	27.8
Province total	**1,454**	**5,141**	**28.3**
Indianapolis	829	1,810	45.8
Evansville	267	835	32.
Fort Wayne	897	3,321	27.
Lafayette, Indiana	313	640	48.9
Province total	**2,306**	**6,606**	**34.9**
Los Angeles	2,844	7,372	38.6
Monterey-Fresno	475	1,707	27.8
San Diego	584	1,715	34.
Tucson	316	979	32.3
Province total	**4,219**	**11,773**	**35.8**
Louisville	864	1,895	45.6
Covington	392	1,031	38.
Nashville	438	706	62.
Owensboro	207	444	46.6
Province total	**1,901**	**4,076**	**46.6**
Milwaukee	1,692	7,000	24.2
Green Bay	606	2,837	21.4
La Crosse	366	2,110	17.3
Madison	405	1,437	28.1
Superior	329	1,162	28.3
Province total	**3,398**	**14,546**	**23.4**

Diocese	Mixed marriages	Total marriages	% of mixed marriages
Newark	2,319	13,535	17.1
Camden	647	2,252	28.7
Paterson	556	2,692	20.6
Trenton	1,016	4,389	23.1
Province total	**4,538**	**22,868**	**19.8**
New Orleans	1,815	5,927	30.6
Alexandria	513	1,079	47.5
Lafayette, La.	633	3,962	16.
Little Rock	272	452	60.
Mobile	676	1,064	63.6
Natchez	544	908	60.
Province total	**4,453**	**13,392**	**33.3**
New York	3,223	15,219	21.1
Albany	1,451	4,942	29.
Brooklyn	4,040	27,395	14.7
Buffalo	1,987	7,980	24.9
Ogdensburg	525	1,774	29.6
Rochester	1,506	4,814	31.3
Syracuse	1,336	4,968	26.9
Province total	**14,058**	**67,092**	**21.**
Omaha	450	1,755	25.6
Grand Island	174	545	31.9
Lincoln	241	728	33.2
Province total	**865**	**3,028**	**28.5**
Philadelphia	3,417	16,025	21.3
Altoona	327	1,975	16.1
Erie	990	3,054	32.4
Harrisburg	671	1,715	39.1
Pittsburgh	3,116	14,847	20.9
Scranton	980	5,603	17.8
Province total	**9,501**	**43,219**	**22.**
Portland, Oregon	685	1,266	54.1
Baker City	118	196	60.2
Boise	280	536	52.2
Great Falls	300	625	48.
Helena	224	588	39.6
Seattle	1,153	2,247	51.3
Spokane	255	584	43.6
Province total	**3,015**	**6,042**	**49.9**

Diocese	Mixed marriages	Total marriages	% of mixed marriages
St. Louis	1,742	5,806	30.
Kansas City, Kans.	436	1,239	35.2
Kansas City, Mo.	477	1,222	39.
St. Joseph	213	472	45.1
Salina	180	733	24.5
Wichita	371	1,204	30.8
Province total	**3,419**	**10,676**	**32.**
St. Paul	1,984	5,487	36.1
Bismarck	221	901	24.5
Crookston	199	507	39.2
Duluth	575	1,282	44.9
Fargo	210	947	22.2
Rapid City	292	632	46.2
St. Cloud	304	1,490	20.4
Sioux Falls	377	1,134	33.2
Winona	358	1,189	30.1
Province total	**4,520**	**13,569**	**33.3**
San Antonio	452	3,102	14.5
Amarillo	138	368	37.4
Austin	155	690	22.5
Corpus Christi	214	2,538	8.4
Dallas	491	1,053	46.5
Galveston	594	1,362	43.6
Oklahoma City and Tulsa	482	1,043	46.2
Province total	**2,526**	**10,156**	**24.8**
San Francisco	2,326	6,814	34.1
Reno	352	784	44.9
Sacramento	418	951	44.
Salt Lake City	178	341	52.2
Province total	**3,274**	**8,890**	**36.8**
Santa Fe	168	2,002	8.4
El Paso	127	1,517	8.4
Gallup	69	310	22.3
Province total	**364**	**3,829**	**9.5**
Washington, D. C.	1,709	3,256	52.6
Pittsburgh Greek Rite	352	5,953	5.9
Byzantine Rite	299	1,798	16.7

The next step taken in this analysis was to seek some relation between the percentage of mixed marriages in each diocese and some other factor available to the statistician. A glance at Table C will show that it is more or less true that the higher the proportion

of Catholics in a diocese the lower its rate of mixed marriages. But since this is a statistical law, it is not to be relied on for a *priori* judgements in particular cases.

The percentage of Catholic population given in Table C was computed from the totals given in each diocesan summary in the 1948 edition of *The Catholic Directory* for the Catholic and the general population of each diocese. One uses these figures with caution, for the latter is inaccurate due to the natural increase and the internal migration since the national census of 1940. The former total is unreliable because there has never been a general Catholic census and the data we have are mostly approximation.

TABLE C—MIXED MARRIAGES AND CATHOLIC POPULATION

Diocese	% of marriages mixed	% of population Catholic
Pittsburgh Greek Rite	5.9	—
Corpus Christi	8.4	71.6
El Paso	8.4	42.8
Santa Fe	8.4	47.6
Portland, Maine	11.9	25.3
Fall River	14.2	50.9
San Antonio	14.5	34.4
Brooklyn	14.7	25.
Providence	15.5	60.
Lafayette, La.	16.	65.5
Altoona	16.1	20.8
Byzantine Rite	16.7	—
Pueblo	17.	23.3
Newark	17.1	39.2
La Crosse	17.3	24.3
Scranton	17.8	33.4
Dubuque	19.	17.7
Boston	20.	42.3
Chicago	20.	39.2
St. Cloud	20.4	27.5
Paterson	20.6	30.6
Springfield, Mass.	20.7	47.5
Pittsburgh	20.9	35.2
New York	21.1	26.2
Philadelphia	21.3	27.6
Green Bay	21.4	38.1

Diocese	% of marriages mixed	% of population Catholic
Cleveland	21.8	25.7
Fargo	22.2	18.2
Detroit	22.3	26.6
Gallup	22.3	27.5
Austin	22.5	9.9
Trenton	23.1	30.
Saginaw	23.7	25.9
Milwaukee	24.2	31.5
Bismarck	24.5	21.1
Salina	24.5	12.3
Buffalo	24.9	49.1
Manchester	25.5	36.3
Omaha	25.6	23.2
Marquette	26.3	26.5
Syracuse	26.9	31.3
Fort Wayne	27.	18.1
Monterey-Fresno	27.8	24.8
Sioux City	27.8	13.4
Madison	28.1	19.7
Superior	28.3	20.1
Camden	28.7	20.
Albany	29.	29.9
Ogdensburg	29.6	35.2
St. Louis	30.	25.5
Winona	30.1	13.4
Belleville	30.2	10.4
New Orleans	30.6	41.8
Wichita	30.8	7.4
Grand Rapids	31.	9.1
Rochester	31.3	34.3
Burlington	31.4	27.2
Lansing	31.4	8.5
Grand Island	31.9	9.7
Evansville	32.	14.
Tucson	32.3	39.
Erie	32.4	19.4
Lincoln	33.2	8.7
Sioux Falls	33.2	12.7
San Diego	34.	24.2
Toledo	34.	19.2
San Francisco	34.1	22.
Kansas City, Kans.	35.2	13.4

Diocese	% of marriages mixed	% of population Catholic
Rockford	35.2	18.8
Cincinnati	35.5	17.3
Denver	35.9	11.8
St. Paul	36.1	24.3
Amarillo	37.4	4.6
Youngstown	37.8	19.
Hartford	37.9	39.2
Covington	38.	5.1
Los Angeles	38.6	16.4
Cheyenne	38.8	16.
Kansas City, Mo.	39.	6.7
Harrisburg	39.1	9.4
Crookston	39.2	13.4
Wilmington	39.2	7.5
Helena	39.6	26.3
Des Moines	40.	7.5
Springfield, Ill.	40.6	11.2
Peoria	41.2	14.8
Steubenville	41.3	15.5
Davenport	41.5	11.1
Wheeling	43.5	3.1
Galveston	43.6	14.3
Spokane	43.6	10.7
Sacramento	44.	16.5
Duluth	44.9	23.
Reno	44.9	20.
St. Joseph	45.1	4.7
Louisville	45.6	14.4
Indianapolis	45.8	8.7
Oklahoma City and Tulsa	46.2	3.5
Rapid City	46.2	28.7
Dallas	46.5	3.1
Owensboro	46.6	4.5
Columbus	47.2	9.
Alexandria	47.5	6.3
St. Augustine	47.9	4.8
Baltimore	48.	17.
Great Falls	48.	16.7
Lafayette, Ind.	48.9	5.1
Seattle	51.3	10.8
Boise	52.2	4.3
Salt Lake City	52.2	3.3

Diocese	% of marriages mixed	% of population Catholic
Washington, D. C.	52.6	22.6
Portland, Ore.	54.1	10.1
Little Rock	60.	1.7
Natchez	60.	2.
Baker City	60.2	5.6
Nashville	62.	1.2
Richmond	62.5	3.
Mobile	63.6	2.2
Savannah-Atlanta	68.5	1.9
Raleigh	70.3	.4
Charleston	72.4	.8
Belmont Abbey	100.	.7
United States	**26.07**	**19.4**

EDWARD S. DUNN, S.J.

Woodstock College
Woodstock, Maryland

THE VIRTUE OF MEEKNESS

Meekness, therefore, is not a natural virtue, and we do not arrive at it through our own strength or simply by saying: I want to be meek.

It is a virtue characteristic of Jesus Christ, entirely supernatural. In order to practice it, we have need of His grace, and it must be a powerful grace. The point is that we must completely vanquish our vanity; this is not so easy. But when we accomplish it, we are pleasing to Jesus Christ, Who only converses with the meek. Then we possess the kingdom of Heaven, we are able to win over souls to God, and we merit the reward of reigning with the Lamb.

—Blessed Peter Julian Eymard, in *The Eucharist and Christian Perfection* (New York: The Sentinel Press, 1948), I, 121.

RATUM NON CONSUMMATUM

Part III

Alice Brownell Fairchild took the chair indicated for her, after she taken an oath to tell the truth, and nervously straightened her skirt. This was it, she thought. This would tell whether or not she would be able to marry Ed. How she wished that he might be here at her side as she underwent this ordeal. The man sitting at the bench seemed so stern and forbidding and the one at the end of it, who was just now handing an envelope to the first man, looked as if he could see into her very soul. The third man present with his pad of paper before him did not seem so frightening, she noted with some relief. He just looked harrassed and over-worked as he unscrewed the cap of his pen and fitted it into place and started to write.

Had she but known it, the *Officialis* at the bench was wondering how he could best put the petitioner at ease. She was obviously nervous and until she calmed down he could not be certain that he was getting the most accurate statement possible from her. More than once in previous cases he had found that nervous witnesses tended to cloud the issues before the court so that much time was lost in unraveling the tangled threads of evidence which they gave. It might be that the trick of confusing a witness was useful when the witness was trying to hide some material fact, but that was rather a trick to be used in cross-examination when it was necessary to test the truth or accuracy of a story already told. For the present, it was the *Officialis'* problem to get out of the petitioner an accurate and straight-forward statement of what she knew about the fact of non-consummation of her marriage and of the reasons for granting the dispensation. There would be time enough later, after the principal statement was on the record, to see whether she was telling the truth.

The Defender, for his part, also wished that the lady would calm down. It was true that he would later have questions asked to test her veracity and accuracy, but for now all he wanted was to hear her story to know what points to check for truth and accuracy. If she became too nervous and confused he would have to cut through a maze of irrelevant details to find out what she really

meant to say. He, too, therefore, tried to smile reassuringly at the woman that she might calm down.

This was the second session of the hearing, the Notary jotted on his pad. In the first the Tribunal had been brought together and the letter of the Sacred Congregation on the regulation of the Sacraments authorizing the Bishop to proceed in the matter had been read. At the same session the document whereby the Bishop had appointed the members of the Tribunal and their substitutes had also been presented. Finally, in that session the petition had been scrutinized and the order for summons had been issued.[1]

It would have been permissible, if it had been possible, to complete the whole hearing in the one session. There was, however, so much testimony to be taken that it was necessary to divide the proceeding into several sessions.[2] As a rule, when the judge decreed the close of one session he also determined the time for the next, and of this the Notary made an appropriate notation in the record of the case.[3] It was not the custom of this court to have hearings at fixed times on determined days, though in a court more burdened with cases that might have been necessary.[4]

The summons to Alice Brownell Fairchild, which she had received from the messenger of the court some ten days ago,[5] was couched in terms of an invitation, though there was a note of command in it, too. It told her that the judge wanted her to appear, specifying her by her full name and address. It gave, too, the name of the *Officialis* before whom she was to appear, and the place and time of the hearing. The reason why she was to appear was also expressed, namely that she might make her statement as to her side of the case. The summons was, as usual, signed by the *Officialis* and the Notary and bore the impress of the seal of the diocesan Tribunal.[6]

The summons was enclosed in an envelope and handed to the messenger of the court. Thus, no one could find out about Mrs. Fairchild's problems unless she herself chose to talk about them. The messenger was under instructions himself to deliver it to her privately and personally. A copy of this summons, as of each one

[1] Cf. Art. 34, §1.
[2] Cf. Art. 33, §1.
[3] Cf. Art. 33, §2.
[4] Cf. Art. 34, §2.
[5] Cf. Art. 35.
[6] Cf. Art. 36; Can. 1715, §1.

issuing from the court, was kept in the record of the case. The messenger, after he returned from serving the summons, made his "return" or report on the copy which remained in the files and signed it. Thus the judge could readily see just what had happened when the summons was delivered.

If the distance from the see city had been too great for the messenger of the court to make the trip to deliver the summons, the matter could easily have been handled, as it so often was, by sending the summons by registered mail with a return receipt requested. That receipt would then be put in the file along with the copy of the summons to show that the party in question had been properly served and had thus had notice of the hearing which was to take place, with the result that failure to appear to protect her rights was due to her own neglect rather than to any fault on the part of the Tribunal.[7]

As far as the petitioner was concerned, her whereabouts were known to the court, so there was no need to resort to service of the summons by publication. Had this been necessary the judge would have ordered the publication of an edict summoning the party in question to appear. The original of the edict would have been affixed at the door of the Chancery Office by the court messenger who would then make his usual report of what he had done. The edict would have remained affixed there for whatever length of time the judge considered necessary. Since not many people would have had the chance to see the edict published at the door of the Chancery Office, a copy of it would have appeared in some newspaper of general circulation in the region so that it might come to the attention either of the person who was sought for questioning or of others who might know him and might then pass along to him the information that he was wanted. If it was not possible to do both of these things, either one, edict or newspaper publication, would suffice;[8] but the case hardly ever occurred where both could not be done.

Alice Brownell Fairchild had answered the summons and was present in court. It was to her advantage to be there, for she wanted to tell her story to the authorities and thus obtain, she hoped, from them a dispensation from her marriage vows. Others,

[7] Cf. Art. 37; Can. 1719.

[8] Cf. Art. 38, §1; Can. 1720.

however, summoned by the court might not be so willing to appear. In that case it would be necessary to see what could be done to secure their attendance. The judge might determine to send another summons, or he might feel that some other approach was to be preferred. Thus, he might seek to have some other person who was a friend of the one sought or who was much respected by that person go to see the witness and persuade him to appear. The Rules counseled that so far as possible the judge would be wise to abstain from using coercive measures to change the mind of one who was contumacious.[9]

The judge was likewise instructed by the Rules to see whether, if one of the parties or witnesses refused to appear, the matter in regard to which they were to be interrogated could not be supplied in some other manner, for example, by calling other witnesses who knew the facts and would come willingly.[10]

In a matter so delicate as this, in which a great deal hinged on the truthfulness and accuracy of the parties themselves who were the only ones who really knew whether the marriage had or had not been consummated, it would be dangerous to compel one of them to attend and testify against his will. The resulting information might be so colored by animosity as completely to upset the case so that the truth would not be known. Likewise, the witnesses who were to bolster the reputation of the parties might only confuse the court the more, were they compelled against their will to appear and to testify. It was much safer to have everybody happy to appear.

When Alice Brownell Fairchild took the oath to tell the truth before being questioned she placed her right hand upon the book of Gospels open upon the table at which sat the Notary. This was the regular procedure in ecclesiastical trials, this taking of the oath before the interrogation began. Should, however, a witness refuse to take such an oath and should the judge hearing the case think that the witness was able to give information useful for the discovery of the truth of the matter, the Rules permitted him to hear the testimony of the witness unsworn. Mention would be made, of course, in the record of the case by the Notary of the fact that the witness had refused to testify under oath with a statement of the

[9] Cf. Art. 38, §2.

[10] Cf. Art. 38, §3.

reason for such refusal, for example, that the person did not believe that one should ever take an oath. Were such a notation not made, the Congregation reviewing the case might assume that the witness had taken the oath as usual and that through an oversight no mention of the fact had been made in the record, or it might wonder just what had happened in the court-room.

The *Officialis,* before the actual ceremony of the taking of the oath, had warned the petitioner of the sanctity of the act she was about to perform and of the most serious sin she would commit if she should perjure herself in the course of her testimony. He pointed out the particular seriousness of the matter involved in this type of hearing and the very sad consequences which would attend perjury in this case. It might, indeed, lead to a dispensation being granted where there was no power in the eyes of God to grant it, with the result that before God the party would be living in adultery contrary to His commandment.

Seeing that the petitioner was sufficiently impressed, the *Officialis* did not think it necessary to go farther and mention the penalties which, within the sphere of her competence, the Church inflicts upon perjurers. Those penalties were: (a) personal interdict, in the case of a lay person; (b) suspension, in the case of a cleric.[11]

True, the judge would not inflict those penalties without first consulting the Bishop; but if the latter approved it the judge might inflict upon Mrs. Fairchild the personal interdict should she perjure herself in giving her testimony. A personal interdict, like any other interdict, would leave her in communion with the Church, but it would prevent her from participating in certain sacred rites of the Church.[12] A personal interdict would mean a direct prohibition against use by her of certain benefits, whereas a local interdict would be an indirect prohibition forbidding the dispensation or reception of such benefits within a certain territory.[13]

A personal interdict would follow her everywhere she went, so that mere change of scene would not restore her right to participate in the sacred rites which were forbidden her.[14] This meant that she would not be able to assist at divine services, except at the preaching

[11] Cf. Art. 40; Can. 1743, §3.
[12] Cf. Can. 2268, §1.
[13] Cf. Can. 2268, §2.
[14] Cf. Can. 2269, §2.

of the word of God. Of course, if she was present in church it would not be necessary to ask her to leave, for she would not be taking an active part in the services. Furthermore, it meant that she would not be able to receive any of the sacraments or sacramentals of the Church. Finally, it meant that she would not be entitled to ecclesiastical burial.[15]

Under the warming influence of the friendliness of the *Officialis* and the Defender of the Bond Mrs. Fairchild began to lose some of her nervousness. As the *Officialis* began to ask his questions, prepared for him by the Defender, she relaxed a bit in her chair and answered in a voice which grew stronger as she became more accustomed to her surroundings. The Defender contented himself for the time being with merely observing how she answered the questions on the list which he had handed to the judge, though he was ready at any moment to jot a new question on a slip of paper and pass it to the judge, should that be necessary to keep her story clear.[16]

The questions prepared by the Defender were partly general and partly specific. The former were intended to bring out background information on the witness under interrogation. Thus, they sought to bring out her full name, the names of her parents, and her age. They also went into the matter of her religion, her state in life, her residence, and her position in the case. This sort of general interrogation was customary no matter who was the witness, for it tended to inform the court of where the witness stood in the case and did much to enable the Congregation on review to get a clear picture of the case, seeing just where each of the parties and witnesses stood in relation thereto. If some one or other of the questions did not seem necessary to the presiding judge, he could, of course, omit it, when, for example, the picture would be sufficiently clear without it.

The latter questions, the specific ones, were directed to bringing out the truth with regard to the fact of non-consummation and with regard to the reasons for granting the dispensation. These constituted by far the greater number of the questions on the Defender's list and were carefully prepared so as to elicit all that the

[15] Cf. Can. 2275; 2260, §1; 1240, §1,2°.

[16] Cf. Art. 41.

person being questioned knew about that fact and those reasons. These were the ones which called for the greatest thought and skill in their preparation, for they had to be designed to get the witness to talk freely in the first place and then to check on the truth and accuracy of her statements, confirming or convicting her out of her own mouth. As to every point, too, the judge wanted to know the basis of her information, whence she got it, when she learned of it, and in what way the information had come to her.[17]

The questions were brief, with no suggestions in them which might "lead" the witness to say one thing rather than another. They were kept simple, too, each one containing but one point on which the court wanted information. The Defender, the *Officialis* knew, had been doing this sort of thing long enough to know how to avoid complex questions containing more than one point. That was a good thing, he reflected, for he had known some less expert Defenders to prepare a list containing questions which kept the judge so busy looking ahead to break them down into simple ones that he missed part of what the witness was saying.

Another thing for which the *Officialis* was thankful was that the Defender kept out of his list of questions everything which did not pertain to the case before the court. There was no danger of wandering astray into possibly interesting but completely useless by-ways when one followed his list. Not infrequently, when dealing with cases in which less experienced men participated, the *Officialis* had been annoyed by the necessity of weeding out irrelevant material from the lists of points submitted by the attorneys for the parties.

Mrs. Fairchild's relaxation in the witness chair was due in no small measure to the fact that she found she could easily understand what the judge wanted to know. She had been afraid that these learned and imposing gentlemen would talk way over her head and that she would make a bad impression on them by stumbling around trying to answer their questions. If she stumbled, she feared, she might prejudice her case. That was one of the great sources of her initial nervousness. Now, however, she found that they did not talk in language that was hard to understand at all. They were serious, it was true, but she had expected them to be

[17] Cf. Art. 42; Can. 1774.

serious. They did not, however, use high-sounding and technical language, so she responded readily. That was why, though she did not know it, the Rules directed that the questions be fitted to the mental capacity of the witness and be set forth in the language of the country.[18]

The answers to the questions of the judge were given orally in open court. There had been no opportunity for Mrs. Fairchild to read the questions beforehand. "Coaching" of the witness could only lead to an inaccurate picture of the case as it was presented to the judge, and even more as it was sent on to the Congregation. She had not even thought of bringing along a statement to be read, and if she had, after reading about what people did before Committees of Congress, she would not have been permitted to read it. If the court had felt that there was something to be gained from allowing her to read some important document which would serve to prove what she said, or to refresh her memory, she might have done that; but there was too much danger that any other written statement prepared in advance might falsify her memory of the events as they really had taken place, to allow her to use it.[19]

The answers which the petitioner gave were written down at once by the Notary, who took care to put down the words she used rather than just the substance of what she said.[20] This took a lot of fast writing, for Alice Brownell Fairchild was inclined to speak rapidly, but it was necessary, as the Rules indicated. The Rules were right, the members of the court knew, for they had seen too often in other cases how what had appeared at the time to be a satisfactory summary of the substance of the witness' story had turned out to be more of a hindrance than a help when it came to deciding a case. Memory turned on such little things, a word here and a gesture there, that a mere summary of what had been said was quite unsatisfactory when the judge later tried to reconstruct in his mind from a reading of the record just what had occurred in the courtroom. He might hope that his decision was the correct one, and, in truth, it might be; but there was always the nagging uncertainty when one could not put one's finger on the exact place in the testimony where the impression which now influenced the decision had been received.

[18] Cf. Art. 43, §1.

[19] Cf. Art. 43, §2; Can. 1776-1777.

[20] Cf. Art. 44, §1; Can. 1778.

When the words could not be written down, either because they were spoken too rapidly, or because they were not proper and were not logically coherent, the judge was authorized to dictate the answer which was to be put into the record.[21] When he did that, of course, the witness could hear what he said and object if he did not state accurately what was in the witness' mind.

Since the questions on the Defender's list from which the *Officialis* was reading were already typed up, the Notary simply indicated the number of the question and put down on his pad the answer thereto. When, however, the *Officialis* added a question of his own *ex officio,* or read one which the Defender suggested in the course of the interrogation, the Notary wrote down the question verbatim before putting down the answer to it.[22]

Thus the record kept by the Notary showed completely what took place in the court-room, for it gave the questions asked and the answers given, together with the indication whether or not the oath was taken, and anything else of importance which chanced to take place during the session.[23] This gave the Congregation, when it came to review the case, as complete and as satisfactory a picture as possible of what had occurred during the hearing. For men who had to render their decision at such a distance and without an opportunity to see and hear the witnesses as they gave their testimony, and so without an opportunity to gather all those intangible impressions which together have so much weight in judging of the importance which is to be attached to each bit of testimony, the record kept by the Notary was of vital importance.

Before Mrs. Fairchild left the court-room the record of her testimony was read back to her, so that she might know just what the Notary had quoted her as saying in response to each of the questions which had been asked of her. This was done so that she might have an opportunity to add to her previous answers, to strike out what she did not want to be represented as saying, to correct any errors which might have occurred in writing up the answers, to change any statements she had made so that they might correspond more exactly to the truth. When, finally, she announced that she was satisfied with the report of her statements she

[21] Cf. Art. 44, §2.

[22] Cf. Art. 44, §3.

[23] Cf. Art. 45; Can. 1779.

was again asked to take an oath. This time the oath was to the effect that she had told the truth in giving the statement which she had authorized and that she would not reveal to others, while the case was still in progress, the questions asked of her and the answers she had given. At last, she was asked to sign the Notary's record of her statements together with the *Officialis,* the Defender, and the Notary himself.[24]

Outside the court-room, Mrs. Fairchild reflected that it had not been as bad as she had expected it would be. The men had been very considerate and kind. All they had been interested in, so far as she could see, was that the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth be presented. She had told them all she knew. They had been very careful in their examination and had left no stone unturned, that was true, but they had been very nice about things, too. If they were equally searching in the questions asked of her husband, she felt that it must appear that she was right in asserting that the marriage had never been consummated.

She could not, however, see why they had asked her to swear that she would not reveal what questions they had asked of her or the answers which she had given. She would keep her promise, of course, but it did not seem to make sense. She could understand the oath that she had told the truth, and she knew she had, so she did not mind taking it. Why did they not want her to talk about what they had asked her? Unskilled in the problems of "manufactured evidence" she did not understand, and would probably have been horrified to learn, that it had been known to happen, when a case was really difficult, that people who wanted very badly to win framed their answers beforehand to meet the line which they thought the court would follow in its questioning of the witnesses. That line, if they were clever, they could guess at from the questions which the court asked of other witnesses who took the stand ahead of them.

Such failure to tell the truth under oath would, of course, be perjury, but, as she again might have been horrified to know, there were people in the world who did not scruple to commit perjury in violation of one Commandment of God in order to gain by fraud from the constituted authorities a "permission" which would let

[24] Cf. Art. 46.

them violate another Commandment of God without, at least, censure from their fellow-men who did not know the true state of facts.

Mrs. Fairchild had been heard first because it was she who had presented the petition.[25] The petition was a written statement of what she sought in the case, and the purpose of hearing her first was to increase the knowledge of the court as to the matters which she there asserted. What was there written was not given under oath, so the hearing afforded a check on the accuracy of the statement, made at a time when the petitioner was conscious of the importance of telling the truth. With this statement of the petitioner to broaden the base laid by the petition, the court would now be able to go forward with a better idea of just what would have to be brought out from the other party and from the witnesses to show whether the reasons alleged for the seeking of the dispensation were true and whether non-consummation was really present.

Even in a case such as this, wherein both parties seemed to want the same thing, namely a dispensation from the marriage vows, the wife would ordinarily be heard first. Because of the danger of collusion when the parties were not opposed to each other in their desires, they would be asked very carefully about the reasons why both of them agreed on seeking the dispensation.[26]

Further to guard against collusion under such circumstances, the court would call, likewise, witnesses on its own motion, *ex officio,* to double-check on the stories told by the parties. There might be some very good reason, as there seemed to be here, why both agreed on seeking the dispensation, or the witnesses might reveal that the marriage had really, or at least very likely, been consummated and that the parties had subsequently become so filled with antipathy toward each other that they were willing to do anything in order to get free from their bond.[27]

Going over the report of the testimony given by the petitioner after the Notary had typed it up, the *Officialis* noted that the answers to the general questions showed the same things as were contained in her petition with regard to her name, parentage, age, religion, state in life, and place of residence and domicile. She had stated, too, that she was faithful in the practice of her religion.

After he had directed the Notary to read to her the names of

[25] Cf. Art. 50, §1. [26] Cf. Art. 50, §2. [27] Cf. Art. 50, §3.

the *Officialis,* Defender, and Notary, so that she might know before whom she sat, she had relaxed considerably, he recalled. It was at that point that he had tried to induce her to be reconciled with her husband. He had pointed out, he recalled, the sanctity of marriage and the way in which Divine Grace can help those who are willing to overcome the obstacles in the way of conjugal harmony. He had mentioned, too, how much more tranquil one's conscience usually is in returning to the original plan of living together, and how the families, both hers and his would be much happier if this situation were not pressed farther. He had indicated also the difficulties which lay ahead in the course of the proceedings which were necessary before a dispensation could be granted. He had, finally, asked her what reasons precisely there were for not being reconciled with her husband, in the hope that it might still be possible to do something to eliminate them. The answer, in keeping with what was contained in her petition, was simply that she had tried as hard as she could to get her husband to stay with her, but that he had refused to have anything more to do with her.

Thus, her petition was corroborated under oath as to the impossibility of reconciliation and as to the reasons why it was impossible. He would have to try the same thing with the respondent husband, to see whether he would change his mind, but he had little hope of success there, considering the mental state into which the man had got himself. Still, as long as there was some slight chance of saving a marriage which had started out auspiciously the *Officialis* knew that he was bound to try to save it. The love of these two for one another might have grown very cold, but there might still be a spark of it left which, carefully nurtured, could be made to burst once more into flame. If that were so, they would be happier than if they were allowed to go through life with the scars of a dead love on their hearts.

In the answers directed more specifically to the facts of the case the *Officialis* found that Mrs. Fairchild had reaffirmed the statements contained in her petition as to each of its parts when it was read back to her. She told the court frankly that she had gone to Fr. Brockheim and that he had helped her draw up the petition to be presented to the Sacred Congregation through the good offices of the Bishop.

She had recounted the occasion of her meeting with her present

husband there in the hospital during the war and told what a short time, really, they had had to get acquainted with each other. It was the usual story of the war-time marriage when people under the pressure of events, and uncertain as to what the morrow might bring, tried to snatch at what happiness for the moment presented itself.

Her parents and his had not been asked what they thought of the marriage. After all, they were so far away, and there was so little time, that they had not been able to consult their parents. It was all that the Chaplain could do to find out whether they were free to marry. Their parents had known of the marriage, to be sure, but her parents did not know the person whom she was marrying and his parents did not know her. They could not very well say whether they were in favor of the person or not. They just left the matter to the judgment of the boy and girl, they said in their letters. After all, they were both over twenty-one and supposedly were able to decide for themselves.

When they finally decided on a date for the wedding there was no time for the banns to be published, and a dispensation, or something like that, had to be obtained. They had been married there on the island in the base chapel in the presence of some of their friends who were stationed there at the time. It was the usual sort of service marriage with whatever celebration was possible under the circumstances, with a marriage breakfast at the Officers' Club after the Mass.

They just never did have a chance to live together. The call to scramble had come through while they were still in their respective quarters packing to go on their honeymoon trip. They had never had a home together, nor had they ever even had a hotel room together. Even when they had been able to get together one time during the war they had never been alone together.

Once, it was true, she admitted, they had managed to wangle a jeep and had gone off on a picnic together down the beach a little distance, but she insisted that they had not done anything even at that time. There had been some talk about what they would do after the war was over and they could settle down some place together. Mostly, however, they had talked of little, inconsequential things, such as people talk about when they want to take their minds off the awful over-hanging sense of doom which over-

takes people shortly about to be separated again in the turmoil of war.

There had been a moment when she had thought that they might do something about being married to each other, but then some other people had come along and shouted to them and that had been the end of that. After a lot of joking all around the whole party had clambered into the jeep and raced back to the Club for drinks.

(*To be continued*)

THOMAS OWEN MARTIN

The Catholic University of America
Washington, D. C.

PREACHERS AND CONFESSORS

Surely a good preacher can win souls, but so can a good confessor. Preaching is the soul of the priestly work, while confession is its heart. Preachers begin the work of salvation, confessors bring it to completion; preachers make known the will of heaven, confessors have it practiced; preachers are doctors giving general principles, teaching the faithful to love and serve God, confessors are physicians imparting individual direction and treatment. Preachers pronounce what remedies will be effectual, confessors apply them. Preachers are the trumpets of God, confessors are the soldiers destroying sin; preachers direct the artillery of eternity from a distance and not always accurately, while confessors battle at close quarters.

Preachers are God's watchdogs, who drive away the ravening wolf; confessors are His guardians who rescue souls about to be devoured. Preachers exhort, confessors reconcile; preachers are ambassadors of God, speaking in His name, confessors are like little gods, clothed with His power and doing God's work in men's souls.

St. John Eudès, in *The Priest: His Dignity and Obligations* (New York): P. J. Kenedy and Sons, 1947), pp. 144 f.

FAITH AND THE CHURCH

"What do you ask of the Church of God?"

In the Latin rite for the administration of Baptism the Catholic Church proposes this question, through the instrumentality of the minister, to every person presenting himself as a candidate for the reception of this sacrament.

The candidate testifies that the immediate good he wishes to obtain from the company of Our Lord's disciples is "Faith."

The Church then asks another question. "And what does faith bring you to?"

The candidate's answer is: "Life everlasting."

According to this particular section of the Catholic liturgy, then, a man seeks admittance to membership within the Catholic Church in order, ultimately, that he may possess eternal life. He asks to be counted among the members of the Church militant so that he may finally rejoice and glorify God forever within the Church triumphant. In order to obtain this ultimate good, however, the candidate realizes that he must have the faith. And, it is precisely this saving faith which he seeks from the hands of the Catholic Church.

The dialogue that prefaces the Catholic ceremony of Baptism according to the Roman rite implies that, in some way or another, the salvific divine faith is unobtainable apart from the true supernatural kingdom of God on earth. If the faith were to be considered as belonging elsewhere, it would be idle to seek it in any special way at the hands of the Church. Obviously, the formula implies that there is a very special connection between belief in God and the society which Our Lord founded and still rules here on earth.

The fact that such an intimate relation exists is outstandingly manifest on the pages of the New Testament. The Second Epistle of St. Peter describes the members of the Church as those who "have obtained equal faith with us in the justice of our God and Saviour Jesus Christ."[1] St. Paul, in his Epistle to the Galatians designates the citizen's of Our Lord's kingdom on earth as "those

[1] *II Pet.*, 1:1.

who are of the household of the faith (τοὺς οἰκείους τῆς πίστεως)."[2] The Epistle urges as a Christian duty the task of doing good to all men, especially to those of the household of the faith.

At the time when the New Testament books were being written, the members of the true Church commonly spoke of their fellow-disciples as the πιστοί (a term which the Vulgate regularly translates as *fideles*), the "faithful." The Christians of Jewish descent who accompanied St. Peter on his divinely ordered visit to Cornelius the Centurion in Caesarea are "the faithful of the circumcision."[3] The members of the Churches of Ephesus and of Colossa are greeted by St. Paul both as saints ἁγίοι and as πιστοί.[4] The singular form πιστός is frequently employed in the New Testament as an adjective, to designate a person as a member of the Christian community.

The Acts of the Apostles uses the formula "they believed" to indicate the process of conversion to the Church itself. At Joppe "many believed in the Lord," or, in other words, entered the Church as a result of St. Peter's preaching.[5] "Those who believed" is one of the common designations of the members of the Church in the books of the Acts,[6] as is the word πιστεύοντες, or *credentes*.[7] The intimate association of belief in God with the Church, thus expressed in the New Testament, is emphasized in both scholastic and patristic writings. Among the scholastics, the formula which came to be most widely accepted as a definition of the Church militant was *congregatio seu convocatio fidelium in Christo*.[8]

The reason why the life of faith is intimately and basically connected with the true Church of Jesus Christ is not at all difficult to see. The true Church on earth, the company of Our Lord's disciples, is essentially a society in a status of preparation. The supernatural life, of which the corporate activity of the Church militant is the one social expression in this world, *belongs* in heaven rather

[2] *Gal.*, 6:10.

[3] *Acts*, 10:45.

[4] Cf. *Eph.*, 1:1; *Col.*, 1:2.

[5] Cf. *Acts*, 9:42.

[6] Cf. *Acts*, 2:44; 15:5; 18:27; 21:20, 25; 22:19.

[7] Cf. *Acts*, 4:32; 5:14; 11:21.

[8] Cf. the article "Scholastic Definitions of the Catholic Church," in *The American Ecclesiastical Review* (CXI, 1, 2, and 3 [July, Aug., and Sept., 1944]).

than upon earth. It is a life which is meant to be enlightened by the intellectual knowledge of the beatific vision. The beatific vision, however, pertains of its very nature to the condition of perpetual reward and enjoyment, rather than to the status of trial and preparation. Hence, here on earth, in the expectation of the intuitive supernatural knowledge of God, the supernatural life, in its corporate as well as in its individual expression, demands the presence of true divine faith, the only valid enlightenment about the supernatural order available to those who are preparing for the glory of the beatific vision.

Hence, despite the fact that Catholic theology has always recognized that it is perfectly possible for an individual man to elicit an act of divine faith, and even to possess the supernatural virtue of faith, as a non-member of the true Church, the very principles of this same science assure us that there is a sense in which faith is inseparably joined to God's kingdom on earth. Only as a member of the Church can a man elicit an act of faith which is complete in all of its social perfection. Only as a member of the Church can he make his supernatural belief in God an active and fully effective component in the divinely constituted inward bond of unity within God's household.

The act of faith in God possesses within itself a definite unitive force, tending to join the believer to God and to his brothers within the household of the faith. In the man who is not a member of the Church, but who has real divine faith, the unitive function and the corporate aspect pertaining to this belief are in some measure thwarted and frustrated. Hence, when such a man seeks admittance to the Church, either as a catechumen preparing for baptism or as a baptized person seeking reconciliation, he is actually asking for faith, at least in the sense of the full and corporate completeness of faith, from the only agency in this world competent to give it. The candidate for admission to the Catholic Church asks and receives from the society into which he is being initiated or to which he is being reconciled the social and unitive perfection of faith itself. Hence the first gift the neophyte obtains from his new spiritual home is the fellowship which alone constitutes in this world the corporate unity to which divine faith contributes. By reason of his inclusion as a member within the Church of God, his faith actually achieves the result God intends that it should achieve.

It contributes actively as a component of the inward bond of unity within the company of Christ's disciples.

Since, then, it is possible to seek and to obtain this social and corporate perfection of the faith only from the Church, it is quite accurate to say that, from this particular point of view, the faith itself is something which only the Church is competent to give. The social or unitive function of belief in God is something which, by its very nature, belongs to the act. It would be absolutely inaccurate to esteem it merely as a kind of accidental perfection, apart from which the act or the virtue of divine faith would be really complete. Hence the agency which alone can give this function its proper expression and effect can properly be said to be the reality from which a candidate for the Christian life can seek and obtain the faith itself.

Moreover, it is important to remember that the Church reserves the title of *fideles* exclusively for its own members.[9] Those who accept the content of divine public revelation on the authority of God are designated as *credentes* whether they are members of the Church or not. The name of *fidelis,* however, implies something more than the bare fact of Christian belief. It involves the idea of the profession of that belief in the manner according to which God Himself wills that it should be professed. The *fidelis* is a man who manifests his acceptance of Our Lord's divine message within the household of the faith itself. The baptismal profession of that faith is meant by its very nature to constitute a part of the outward or visible bond of unity within the kingdom of God on earth. The profession of that faith within the Church, by a member of this society, is the basic factor in making the member one of the *fideles.*

[9] After their admission into the catechumenate, candidates for membership in the Church were considered as *Christiani,* but not as fideles. Cf. Duchesne, *Origines du culte chrétien* (Paris, 1898), p. 281. The so-called seventh canon of the second oecumenical council (in reality a portion of a letter sent during the fifth century by the Church of Constantinople to Martyrius of Antioch), speaking of those who come into the Church from paganism or from certain heresies which have completely disfigured the Trinitarian teaching, states that these people are first made Christians, then catechumens. The final step in the process of initiation, that by which they become actual members of the true Church, brings these converts into the ranks of the σωζόμενοι Cf. Hefele-Leclercq, *Histoire des conciles d'apres les documents originaux* (Paris: Letouzey et Ané, 1908), II, 35 ff.

Thus, in still another sense, the man who seeks admittance into the membership of the Catholic Church is actually asking for the perfection of faith from this society. By admitting the candidate into its own fellowship, the Catholic Church gives him a benefit in the line of faith which he could obtain from no other agency on earth. The Catholic Church, and this society alone, is competent to give to any believer in God the complete effectiveness of the profession of his own faith. By his entrance into the Church, the believer finds that the manifestation or profession of his own faith in God acts as God wills that it should act, as an element, indeed as the dominant element, in what has been called the outward or visible bond of unity within the city of God on earth.

We must not allow ourselves to forget that, just as there is a corporate life of divine faith ordained by God in this world, there is also a corporate profession of divine faith. The corporate life of faith is that communal activity carried on in the light of those truths that constitute God's supernatural doctrinal gift to His children. This life actually centers around the sacrificial offering of the Eucharist. In and through this work, the people of God join themselves to Our Lord in His eternal sacrifice. They express and give ultimate effectiveness to their prayers, as individuals, and as the one Body of Christ on earth. They labor effectively for the eternal glory of the Church triumphant. This corporate life of faith finds its perfection in the work of charity. It involves the accurate teaching of God's supernatural message to those for whom Our Lord gave His life on the Cross. This communal life of faith is the perfection which the Catholic Church, and this society alone, can give to a man in this world.

Furthermore, there is also a corporate or communal profession of faith demanded by God. Indeed, the social manifestation of faith is by its very nature the sign on this earth of the company of Our Lord's disciples, the society which lives the corporate life of faith itself. The kingdom of God on earth lives its life of faith in the midst of and despite a hostile environment, the group of men under the sway of God's spiritual enemy, the *ecclesia Satanae*. As a visible society, visibly victorious over this environment, the *ecclesia Dei* must necessarily manifest its acceptance of God's supernatural Christian message. And, as far as the individual believer

is concerned, his profession or manifestation of faith is thus meant by God to be a factor in the unity of His people in this world.

When a man lives as a member of the Catholic Church, and only when he is a member, his profession of divine faith actually contributes towards the social and visible unity which God commands in His followers on earth. And since, as St. Thomas Aquinas has taught, the external manifestation of faith, its *professio* or *confessio,* really pertains to the virtue of faith itself,[10] the Church which alone gives proper and ultimate effectiveness to this profession can truly be described as the institution from which the candidate for Baptism receives the gift of faith. Through this faith of the Church, the Christian can obtain life everlasting.

Heretofore we have considered faith subjectively, belief in God and the manifestation of that belief. There is, however, still another way in which a man may be said to receive the faith from the true Church of Jesus Christ, and from this institution alone. From God's kingdom on earth men receive the objective content of faith, the actual message revealed by God through Jesus Christ Our Lord. It is in the acceptance of this divine public and Christian revelation alone that men perform their duty of faith in God. Consequently the Church, which alone is the authorized and infallible teacher of that message on earth, is the reality from which men receive the faith, considered objectively, or supernatural divine public revelation.

Historically, this is the meaning attached to the introductory dialogue in the Roman rite for the administration of Baptism. During the time when the catechumenate was the ordinary process by which a man prepared for admission into the membership of the true Church, the most important single event in this process was that in which the initial instruction culminated, the conveying to the candidate of the basic formulae of Christian belief. According to Msgr. Duchesne, the Church of Rome marked this particular portion of catechetical training by reading and explaining to the candidate portions of the four gospels, the creed or baptismal profession of faith, and the Lord's prayer. In the preparatory ceremonies immediately preceding Baptism itself, the candidate recited the formula of faith which had previously been entrusted to him.[11]

[10] Cf. *Summa theologica,* IIa-IIae, q. 3, a. 1.

[11] Cf. Duchesne, *op. cit.,* pp. 289 ff.

Traditionally, then, the candidate for admission into the Church seeks from this society the one and only genuine message of Jesus Christ, the teaching absolutely necessary for the attainment of eternal salvation. In seeking this message from the Church, the candidate actually begs it from Our Lord. Actually the Church must not be thought of as a teaching agency in any way separated from Christ. He lives within the Church, according to His promise. He acts as the Head of the Church, in such a way that the essential corporate activity of the Church is produced by Him, acting from within this company. He teaches His own divine message within the Church, in such a way that the man who obtains the objective content of faith from the Church really receives it from Him. The Church is competent, and is alone competent, to give the bread of divine truth to men precisely because of the fact He is its only supreme Teacher, and that the Holy Father and the hierarchy of the Church act as His instruments in the communication of that truth.

This, of course, is the key point in all of the Catholic teaching about faith and the Church. It is only because Our Lord Himself really acts as the supreme Teacher within the company of His own disciples that this company, the kingdom of God on earth, is able to act in the capacity of an authorized, infallible, and living proponent of divine revelation. It is only because of Our Lord's indwelling within the Church as its supreme and ultimate Teacher that this society is the *congregatio fidelium,* in such a way that the enlightenment of the Church militant is the light of divine faith and the life of the Church is the life of faith. Furthermore, it is precisely by reason of Our Lord's indwelling within it that the doctrines proposed by the Church as divine revelation can be received, not on the authority of the Church, but actually on the authority of God Himself.

The Church's prerogative as the only authorized exponent of divine revelation in this world is a matter of tremendous practical importance. Unfortunately the mentality of the world around us, with its highly emotional view of faith itself, and its utter disregard for doctrinal accuracy in the religious sphere, sometimes tends to make even the children of the Church forget the nature and the implications of the Church's unique position with reference to the faith. Actually the faith belongs to the Church because it belongs

to Our Lord. Objectively no individual outside of the Church and certainly no organization apart from the Church can have the slightest right to preach the gospel of the kingdom. The wrong, in such cases, obviously does not consist in the preaching of the truth, but in preaching it out of its proper place. Christ is the one great Prophet of divine truth. No one apart from Him is commissioned objectively to bring that teaching to men. The members of the *ecclesia docens* within the company of Our Lord's disciples, and indirectly those who are commissioned by them to aid in their apostolic labors, act as the ambassadors of Christ when they propose the divinely revealed truth to those for whom Our Lord died.[12] No man has a right to arrogate this function to himself. The presumption of any individual or of any group to act in this capacity without a commission from God is, in itself, one of the most serious violations of the divine order in the universe which can be perpetrated.

According to the very definition of divine faith, the proponent of that faith in this world and, of course, the immediate rule of faith, must necessarily be infallible. To impart the doctrines of divine faith is to present a certain set of teachings for which an absolutely certain assent, based on the authority of God Himself, is demanded. Such a demand would be obviously blasphemous without a perfect assurance that the teachings thus proposed were actually true and actually communicated supernaturally by God. To claim the authority of God for doctrines which He had not imparted to man, or for doctrines which are false in themselves, would be objectively a heinous offence against God, an offense somewhat similar to that of perjury. Hence the Church, which alone is the authorized proponent of the faith, and which alone is the infallible teacher of revealed doctrine in this world, is the institution to which alone the candidate for baptism may legitimately apply for the salutary truths of divine faith.

Again, the catechumen seeks faith from the Church as from a living teacher. The Church stands as a living and infallible pro-

[12] The necessity of a mandate or mission for the salutary preaching of divine truth is treated at great length in one of the outstanding works of polemical theology, the *Tractatus generales de controversiis* by the brothers Peter and Adrian Van Walenburch. The entire eighth treatise of their book is devoted to this concept. The work is printed in the first volume of Migne's *Theologiae cursus completus.*

ponent of the faith only by reason of the presence of Christ within itself. Christ, dwelling within the Church, speaks by the Church's voice to the men of all ages and of all cultures. As His instrument, the Church can explain and propose the content of the divine faith in the face of any difficulties raised by the unrelenting but ever-shifting attack of the world against God's kingdom.

Thus, in its salutary effort to guard against any misrepresentation of the divine message, the Church can always indicate the correct meaning of the teaching entrusted to it. It can definitely resolve questions which have been raised about the significance of the various truths contained in this message. In its teaching, it acts by the authority of God Himself as the immediate rule of divine faith. The teachings which God wills that men should believe on His authority are precisely those so designated by the teaching power of the visible Catholic Church. The Church is the only agency in this world from which men may properly seek the faith of God.

Because of the intimate relations between the Church and the gift of divine faith, a relationship so close that the kingdom of God on earth must be defined and understood in function of faith, there are certain powerful tendencies in our own time against which the loyal Catholic must be on guard. The first of these tendencies is that of assigning to the Church, for all practical purposes at least, what seems to be only an accidental connection with faith and the life of faith. This tendency manifests itself in the idea that true divine faith is to be found commonly or even regularly outside of the Catholic communion, particularly in any organization which thinks of itself as in some way Christian in character. In such teaching a recognition of the Catholic Church is represented as a kind of perfection which, in the general run of things, may or may not come to the person who serves God according to the precepts of Christian belief.

It is conceded that, if a man comes to know more and more about the content of divine revelation, he will eventually learn that the Catholic Church is the true Church and the only authorized proponent of Christian revelation. Yet this information is depicted as something not at all requisite for the faith. All in all, this tendency represents the Church and the knowledge of the Church as

valuable resources for living the life of faith in all of its perfection, yet as definitely not required for the basic act of belief in God.

The men who give expression to this tendency offer what is, in the last analysis, a manifestly faulty explanation of the Catholic teaching on the absolute minimum explicit content of an act of divine faith. As a matter of fact it is perfectly possible to have an act of true divine faith elicited by a person who is not aware that the Catholic Church is the true Church of Jesus Christ. Furthermore, we know that a man can elicit an act of divine faith without being a member of the Church at all. Yet these incontrovertible facts do not in the least constitute the Church as in any way an accidental factor in the life of divine faith. The person who makes a true act of divine faith without being explicitly aware of the Church's position in the order of divine grace actually believes this teaching implicitly. The man who believes without being a member of the Church is, knowingly or unknowingly, accepting a body of doctrine which actually belongs to the Church.

Furthermore, in each one of these cases, there is something manifestly lacking to the perfection of the life of faith. The man who believes without being aware of the Church's position in the supernatural order is, objectively, improperly and incompletely instructed in the divine teaching. The supernatural truths about the Church form one of the most important sections in God's revealed message. The believer who is not aware of these teachings is not in a proper position as a believer. His act of faith is not the standard by which the faith of others is to be evaluated. Although he actually accepts the true divine teaching on the authority of God who has communicated this teaching to mankind, he is sadly ill-instructed about the content of this message.

In exactly the same way, the faith of the man who is not a member of the Catholic Church is actually something out of place. The acceptance of the divine teaching on the authority of God who has revealed it actually belongs within the fabric of God's supernatural kingdom on earth, the *congregatio fidelium*. Thus the position of this act outside of the Church is objectively a violation of the divine order. There is nothing wrong, of course, with the act of faith itself. That remains a good thing wherever it may be. But it definitely is not a good thing to have a person who possesses

the divine gift of faith existing outside of that company which God has formed and constituted as the society of the faith.

Another tendency which stems in great measure from a forgetfullness of the intimate relations between the faith and the Church is that which manifests itself in a weakening of the proper Catholic fervor for doctrinal orthodoxy. Those who are insufficiently aware of the fact that the true faith is the basic concern of the Church are prone, for all practical purposes at least, to think of zeal for the purity of the Catholic faith as a matter of little moment, as something which is hardly necessary in these enlightened days. That was one of the basic attitudes of the Modernists during the early days of the twentieth century. That, unfortunately, seems to be an attitude of a few writers even since that time.

The Catholic Church does, and always has done, a great deal of work for the natural and temporal benefit of its own members, and of all men. Because it is the company within which Our Lord resides, it has never ceased from an unselfish performance of the temporal works of mercy. Nevertheless, the prime concern of the Catholic Church is God's glory in the fullness of Christ, a glory to be achieved ultimately in the eternal felicity of the Church triumphant. It works for the attainment of the purpose for which Our Lord sacrificed His life on the Cross. This is its basic objective.

In the attainment of this objective, it works through faith and the life of faith. It strives to bring the teaching of Christ to its own children, and to influence others to accept this salutary and supernatural body of truth. Obviously, then, it must be vitally concerned with the accurate presentation of this message. The Church is well aware of the fact that it would be nothing short of blasphemous to carry to the children of men, as the message of Jesus Christ, some teachings which God had actually not revealed. It is conscious of the fact that, objectively, there could hardly be a more serious violation of the divine order than the misrepresentation of that message which Our Lord preached as the teaching of His Father.

Since loyalty to the Church is loyalty to Our Lord, and since this fidelity to the Church obviously involves a zeal for those very benefits for which the Church itself strives, it follows that, in itself, an enthusiasm for the purity of the Catholic faith on the part of any

individual member of the Church must be considered, as a manifestation of devotion to Christ. Yet, strange to say, we may sometimes encounter an attitude of opposition among Catholics to zeal for orthodoxy as such. Those who point out and controvert teachings and tendencies which seem in some way opposed to the purity of the faith have all too frequently found themselves attacked as "heresy-hunters." In the circles from which such attacks originate, a man may contradict any proposition with impunity if he considers it "not sufficiently liberal" or "unscientific." But only at his own peril can he reject a proposition because it appears to contradict Catholic doctrine. We can find a rather striking example of this tendency in some of the recent attacks directed against the distinguished theologian, Fr. Garrigou-Lagrange.

Assuredly a statement by any theologian that a definite proposition is or seems to be not in accord with the deposit of faith is an intensely serious thing. If a man makes such an assertion, and that statement turns out to be false, he himself is manifestly in error on some point pertinent to Catholic truth. If he is mistaken, he is certainly bound to correct his error.

If, on the other hand, his evaluation of the proposition under consideration is accurate, then it is definitely the business of all Catholics to heed his warning and to avoid those expressions or attitudes which might misrepresent the teaching of Christ. In any event, the intimate connection of the Church with the life of divine faith makes it imperative that zeal for the purity of the faith should be recognized as incumbent upon all the followers of Christ. The Church from which the little ones of Christ receive the salutary faith of Our Lord is served in proper loyalty only when its members bend every effort to see that its divine message is presented among them in all of its clarity and accuracy.

JOSEPH CLIFFORD FENTON

The Catholic University of America
Washington, D. C.

Answers to Questions

THE *N.* OF THE PRAYER *A CUNCTIS*

Question: The chapel of our house of studies has never been solemnly blessed or consecrated and no special title has been given it. What Saint should be inserted at the letter *N.* of the *A cunctis* prayer at Mass and in the Office? The founder of our religious congregation has never been canonized though there are several saints on the calendar to whom we have special devotion as patrons. May one of these canonized patrons be mentioned at the letter *N.*?

Answer: The rubric governing the Saint to be mentioned in the prayer *A cunctis* is found in the Missal, under the title *Orationes pro diversitate temporum,* just after the Mass for the Third Sunday after Epiphany. There it is directed that at the letter *N.* of the prayer, the canonized titular of the church in which Mass is being celebrated is to be named. Liturgical authorities extend this direction to public or semi-public oratories, provided they have been either consecrated or blessed in the solemn manner found in the Ritual. A decree of the Congregation of Sacred Rites (No. 2814, *ad* 1) legislates that where the oratory in which the Mass is said has no titular, in whose name the place has been set apart for divine worship, the patron of the country or city or district should be the Saint to be mentioned at the *N.* of the *A cunctis.* Members of religious *orders* may *add* the name of their canonized Founder to the titular Saint of the church, or oratory, of celebration (S.R.C., No. 3758) but members of religious *congregations* may not do so without special Apostolic indult (S.R.C., No. 4403, *ad* 2). Hence, in the case proposed, the chapel in question being a semi-public oratory to which no titular has been assigned, the saint to be named at *N.* is to be the national or diocesan patron. If there be none such, and the chapel is in the United States, the Patroness of this country being Our Lady Immaculate, since she is already commemorated in the beginning of the oration, the words *atque beato N.* are omitted in the prayer.

CORRECTING A NON-LITURGICAL ALTAR

Question: We are reconstructing the high altar of our church to make it conform to liturgical requirements. It is built with a canopy supported by columns over the tabernacle. Is it correct to allow this structure to remain, provided we use it only for exposition of the Blessed Sacrament and not for the crucifix? We are arranging to have the latter stand on a step behind the tabernacle and it will rise above the six "high" candles.

Answer: The chief inaccuracy in the construction of the old-fashioned altar was centered in the tabernacle. This structure was usually built so that it could not be surrounded by the required *conopaeum* and it was surmounted by a canopy beneath which the altar-crucifix was regularly stationed. The cross was removed to give place to the ostensorium for solemn exposition so that, contrary to the legislation of the Church (S.R.C., No. 3576, *ad* 3), the same place was used for both the altar-crucifix and the ostensorium at solemn exposition. The altar-crucifix *may* be placed on top of the tabernacle (S.R.C., No. 4136, *ad 2*), provided that this area is not used as the throne of solemn exposition of the Blessed Sacrament. Since the crucifix should be the most prominent ornament of the altar, the ideal would be to have one of large proportions, stationed, as our enquirer suggests, on a step behind the tabernacle. A permanent throne on top of the tabernacle, even though it is used only on the occasion of solemn exposition, is not desirable as it would remain empty most of the time and so be meaningless. Moreover, such a structure interferes with carrying out the prescription of using an all-enveloping *conopaeum* on the tabernacle, covering it not only on all sides but on top as well.

In the reconstruction of the altar, contemplated by our correspondent, we should recommend making the tabernacle a free-standing structure, not joined to any gradines, so that the *conopaeum* can be properly adjusted about it. We should recommend further that the permanent throne with its columns supporting a canopy be removed. For solemn exposition, a portable throne, such as is usual in Rome, might be used, being taken away when not required for this purpose. This movable *expositio* may be placed on top of the tabernacle when the altar-crucifix does not rest on the tabernacle but behind it. If a permanent throne is

desired, this can be built into the reredos of the altar or even into the wall in back of it, provided, in the latter instance, there is some unity with the altar itself. While there is no decree condemning the permanent throne, authorities generally prefer the movable throne except on altars destined for perpetual adoration.

THE *LAVABO* WHEN THERE IS NO SERVER

Question: I am the chaplain of a convent and rarely have an altar-boy to serve Mass. One of the nuns makes the responses but, of course, she cannot carry over the Missal or hand up the cruets. What is the correct thing to do at the *Lavabo*? Should I simply dip my fingers in a bowl of water or should I try to pour the water first with one hand and then with the other?

Answer: Since the rubrics do not contemplate the situation described by the reverend chaplain, there is really no *correct* thing to do under the circumstances and the solution must depend upon the ingenuity of the celebrant. Evidently, when there is a server the latter should pour the water over the tips of the priest's fingers. It would not accord with the directions of the Missal if the priest dipped his fingers in a bowl held by the server (cf. *Ritus serv. in celebratione,* VII, 6). The absence of the minister might well justify the proceeding of washing the fingers by simply dipping them in a bowl of water but, personally, in such an emergency, we have not found it too difficult to pour water first over the fingers of one hand, then over those of the other, changing the cruet from hand to hand to do so, though this involves operating with wet fingers in washing the second hand. Incidentally, we may remark for those who perchance have forgotten, that not all the fingers of each hand but only the tips of the thumbs and index fingers are the subjects of this lotion. It is at Solemn Mass, after the incensation of the altar, that the entire hands are washed (cf. *ibid.,* 10).

WILLIAM J. LALLOU

A PROBLEM IN RESTITUTION

Question: B stole a horse from A, and after using it for two years sold it to C. Shortly afterward the horse died from an

"intrinsic defect." To whom and to what extent must B make restitution?

Answer: In the first place, B must compensate A for any financial losses he sustained by being deprived of the use of the horse for the two years. Thus, if in consequence of the theft A was unable to do his harvesting and so lost a valuable crop, B would be obliged to restore the equivalent in money or kind. As is evident, only a reasonably probable estimate of what the owner would have gained if the horse had not been stolen could be obtained in most cases. From this B can deduct the expenses of keeping the horse. If there were any *fructus naturales,* these too would have to be restored, that is, if the horse had a colt. But B would not have to restore any profit he might have received from the use of the horse during these years.

If the horse had not been sold by B, nothing would have to be restored to A for the horse itself after the death of the beast from an "intrinsic cause," which presumably would have brought about its death even had it remained in the possession of A (cf. Damen, *Theologia moralis* [Rome, 1946], n. 756). But the fact that it was sold and B received a certain price alters the case. Evidently B has no title to the money from the sale, except for a small amount because of his work in effecting the sale. But to whom is he to restore the money? By the general law of contracts he should restore it to C, since there was a substantial defect in the object of the transaction at the time of the sale, begetting a substantial error in the contract (cf. Damen, *ibid.,* n. 850). However, it seems probable that in the sale of horses (especially at a public fair), there is an established custom in favor of the principle *Caveat emptor,* so that if the buyer is so unskilled or unfortunate as to buy a horse that is actually in a dying condition, he must stand the loss (cf. Damen, *ibid.,* n. 931; Davis, *Moral and Pastoral Theology* [London, 1946], II, 379). In this supposition, which seems to be verified in our country, the money from the sale should be restored to A.

SUFFRAGES FOR A DECEASED NON-CATHOLIC

Question: Canon 2262, §2,2, allows priests to apply Masses for excommunicated persons provided it is done privately and there

is no scandal. Would this Canon render it lawful to enroll deceased non-Catholics in a Purgatorial society? Would the granting of a certificate of enrollment make the matter public and cause scandal among the faithful?

Answer: Excommunication as such does not deprive a person of the right to ecclesiastical burial (and consequently to the public celebration of Mass and enrollment in a Purgatorial society) unless there was a declaratory or condemnatory sentence (Canon 1240, §1,2; 1241). However, the law expressly forbids ecclesiastical burial, and consequently public suffrages for those known to have been heretics or schismatics, unless before death they gave some signs of the wish to enter the Church (Canon 1240, §1,1).

It would seem that the enrolling of a deceased non-Catholic in a Purgatorial society together with granting of a certificate of enrollment to a relative or friend of the deceased would amount to the announcement of suffrages, which would render the suffrages public and forbidden (Damen, *Theologia moralis* [Rome, 1946], II, n. 192). Moreover, this could easily be a source of scandal to the faithful. But if the person wishing to enroll the deceased would agree to keep the matter strictly confidential and no certificate were issued, it would seem that the Masses in which he would share would be offered privately, as far as the deceased non-Catholic were concerned. However, if such a procedure were followed, a clear explanation of the matter should be given to the person asking for the enrollment.

FRANCIS J. CONNELL, C.SS.R.

THE MOMENT OF COMMUNION

Practically at the moment of Communion, Jesus is so completely in our hearts and in our souls, that our thoughts and affections may be said to be His also. At first they are in Him, then He communicates them to us according to the measure of our love.

—Fr. Bernadot, O.P., in *From Holy Communion to the Blessed Trinity* (Westminster, Maryland: The Newman Bookshop, 1947), p. 16.

Book Reviews

CATHOLIC SOCIAL ACTION. By John F. Cronin, S.S. Milwaukee: The Bruce Publishing Co., 1948. Pp. 247. $3.50.

You should not ask of a book more than it intends to give. This book gives what it intends to give. It is a good account of what is now happening in much of Catholic Social Action in the United States, and adds many recommendations for improvement.

The first section deals in four rapid chapters with education for Social Action: in schools, in adult education, in training of leaders and in diocesan action. The second deals with work among employers and labor—again in four rapid chapters—work with labor, on promoting industrial peace, on promoting union democracy and on labor legislation. The third deals with the social action of community groups—co-operatives, intercredal and interracial action, Catholic organizations—and with a final chapter on sources of information and a grand reading list and a list of diocesan labor projects.

I do not know anyone who will not be benefited by reading this book. To learn on one's own what is told here would take months of travel, plenty of money, vast information and much time for thought. Even then he would undoubtedly miss a great deal found in this book.

It is a book to keep at one's hand and to read a second and third time. And as you read it, ask yourself the following questions. How can a priest best work for right purposes with the leaders of economic organizations of labor, business, farmers and co-operatives? How can he best work for the same right purposes with legislators and governmental departments and bureaus? And most of all: How can he best work to get Catholic lay organizations to teach Catholic social teaching to their members and get them to work everywhere for its application?

The last of these is the fundamental problem. This book gives a great deal of information upon it. But the problem still remains unanswered. It has finally to be answered in the facts of parish, city, deanery, diocesan, provincial, regional, and national life. The answer depends upon what priests and bishops will do.

R. A. MCGOWAN

PARDON AND PEACE. By Rev. Alfred Wilson, C.P. New York: Sheed and Ward, 1947. Pp. 257. $2.50.

The Sacrament of Penance as a source of peace would seem to be the primary object of this book. And judging by the many panaceas offered

these days that ignore both sin and God, it is an admirable purpose that the book seeks to fill. But the book left this reviewer with decidedly mixed feelings. There are a number of excellent things here. The author expresses himself clearly. There is no question of his experience in the field and the whole leaves the distinct impression that the writer is himself an excellent confessor. The treatment of self-deception in the examination of conscience is obviously the result of much meditation and well-pondered experience. In the same section (pps. 72-116) he sets down an examination of conscience and suggests questions that are a treasure trove for both penitent and confessor. His presentation of the manner of making a good confession and its qualities would make many a confessor's Saturday afternoon and evening a relative pleasure, if widely practiced.

But with all these good things there are a number of points that leave this reader somewhat ill at ease, if not downright disturbed. Some of this uneasiness may be due to the conditioning that results from teaching theology, but none the less it is there. Thus while the light touch has its place there seems to be no value in substituting "best effort and bestest effort" for "ordinary and extraordinary care"; it may be humorous but it smacks of the precious. Nor does there seem to be anything gained either in lightness or clarity by describing Christ as a spiritual motor mechanic. Likewise such expressions as "tonic" sacrament and "keep fit" sacrament leave this reviewer slightly queasy.

While it may be argued that the preceding criticisms are a matter of taste some other points are not so easily explained. Even granting emphasis in view of his object, there are certainly a number of misleading impressions left in the reader's mind. The first forty pages with their insistence on the non-necessity of confessing venial sin (and the fact that many saints did not do so) leaves quite obscure the fact that it is the approved practice of the Church. True, the author quotes from *Mystici Corporis* to this effect, but his emphasis is not in accord with the quotation. It should also be noted that because of a lack of distinction on the point it is not at all clear whether the "adequate relief of mind" that confession gives arises from the fact that sin is forgiven by a sacrament or simply from the fact that the sin is confessed. As a matter of fact this whole point could stand much more emphasis viz., the purpose of the sacrament is to forgive sin through the infusion of sanctifying grace and was so instituted by Christ.

If this review seems overly critical it is because in essence the book has such excellent possibilities and these might have been very well actualized by a careful balancing of expression and emphasis. As it stands it fails to achieve its possibilities.

EUGENE M. BURKE, C.S.P.

INSTITUTIONES IURIS CANONICI. By P. Matthaeus Conte a Coronata, O.F.M. Cap. Vol. IV: *De delictis et poenis.* Editio tertia aucta et emendata. Turin and Rome: Marietti, 1948. Pp. 701. Lire 1200.

The fourth volume of the third and improved edition of Coronata's commentary on the Code of Canon Law is now available. This volume continues in the generally satisfactory quality of the author's doctrine. Coronata deliberately omits an introductory discussion of the right of the Church to impose penalties. There is, however, a brief account of the historical development of the penal legislation now systematically found in the Code.

For the most part sufficient commentary with adequate annotation of the separate canons is found in Coronata's work. Several canons, however, notably Canon 2222, should have received longer explanations. There are serious problems in the application of this canon and one looks in vain here for thorough discussions. On the other hand, a few points not ordinarily found in commentators are presented by Coronata. Attention is especially called to the relative necessity of using procedure to inflict penalties under the first paragraph of Canon 2222. Precisely in this canon convenient use could be made of even a brief foundation explanatory of the penal power of the Church. However, to study Canon 2222 in Coronata's work, one must have at hand either one of the books recommended by the author or some other suitable volume in Public Ecclesiastical Law. Convenience is not served here.

Coronata is to be commended for his intelligent position on several controversial points in penal law. For instance, he admits a valid, though rare, extension of penal law. He admits crimes attributable to corporations but he withholds his consent to placing travelers under the penal law of an alien diocese. In regard to penalties actually inflicted before the loss of a Superior's office, Coronata maintains that these penalties are not in any way automatically cancelled. This is the common opinion, although not universal, in regard to vindictive penalties.

One more point of commentary is worthy of notice. Coronata is not satisfied to include all offices in regard to abuse of power. The author says that the rules of Christian ethics must be considered in the use of the power of these offices. Any Superior who keeps within the text of the law but who sins against these ethics is subject to the provisions of the penal Code. This is good sense.

It is to be regretted that no separate index is furnished with volume IV. Use must be made of a general index published separately. It is the hope of the reviewer that this defect will be remedied in future editions.

EDWARD ROELKER

A Practical Commentary on the Code of Canon Law. By Rev. Stanislaus Woywod, O.F.M., LL.D. Revised by Rev. Callistus Smith, O.F.M., J.C.L. Revised and enlarged Edition. Two Volumes. New York: Joseph F. Wagner, Inc. 1948. Vol. I, pp. xii+833: Vol. II, pp. xi+905.

A revised and enlarged edition of Woywod's commentary on the entire Code of Canon Law is offered by Callistus Smith. This is welcome news especially to those who have relied on this commentary in the past. All the decrees, modifications and interpretations of canon law which appeared since the original edition of this work was published are now found in their proper places.

The general impression created by this new edition of Woywod's commentary is very satisfactory. Seminarians will find this work useful for there is sufficient commentary to aid in the understanding of the text of the law. Advanced students of Canon Law will not, of course, be similarly assisted because here the groundwork is, or should be, largely presupposed.

The opinions of the canonist Woywod as retained in this new edition of his work can generally be accepted. There is not, to be sure, always an adequate discussion of conflicting views, but the opinions asserted are usually supported by acceptable arguments. This is true, for instance, in the matter of the Eucharistic fast midnight Friday-Saturday and also in the use of privileges where no obligation of use exists. Another instance may be cited in the application of the rule; *Quod omnes tangit debet ab omnibus probari.* The author correctly maintains that the personal surrender of rights is under legal control.

Several items, perhaps of more practical importance, are discussed at length. Reference is made here to the explanation of the causes for separation from bed and board and the subsequent right to sue for civil divorce. This latter discussion, however, could have been improved had the matter of particular legislation been considered more in detail. There are restrictions in some dioceses affecting this real or alleged right.

Inaccuracies, of course, are difficult to eliminate. For instance, the author says the permission of the Ordinary is required to give bail. The law requires consultation with the Ordinary, not his permission.

The index of this revised commentary is excellent. The bibliography is comparatively short but will be sufficient for the purpose of this work. The appendices contain documents including the faculties issued to Bishops. A final word is a recommendation of this work.

Edward Roelker

PARADISE HUNTERS. By Reverend W. Kane, S.J. St. Louis: B. Herder Co., 1946. Pp. v + 291. $3.00.

The usual introduction and preface are omitted in *Paradise Hunters* and it is not until we reach the final chapter of this very interesting work of Fr. Kane that we get in his own words the purpose of his book. "There is one central principle which has been emphasized in this book. It is this: we are in exile, both from the earthly paradise which Adam and Eve lost for us and from the eternal paradise which we have yet to win; we waste our time if we keep trying to get back to our lost paradise; we do more than waste our time, we make a flat failure of our lives if we let the futile search for that lost paradise hinder us from attaining the eternal paradise."

Fr. Kane enlarges on this theme, making it not only interesting and readable but very lively and timely. Problems that men face daily and run into constantly are discussed; the problems of sex, greed, poverty, pain, etc.—all the evils that have resulted from original sin and the loss of paradise. His treatment of these problems is open and fair, in language that all can understand. Yet, at the same time he is constructive in his effort to face these situations in a thoroughly Christian way. He urges mankind to accept all these trials by cultivating virtuous practices and through such satisfaction and happiness gain the eternal paradise. "It is in the nature of men to delight in these activities, and therefore it is their right to enjoy the happiness brought them by the success with which they achieve these immediate goals of endeavor on this earth. God, who is the author of supernatural and eternal happiness, is the ultimate author also of natural and temporal happiness. . . . Saving one's soul means simply securing one's eternal happiness. There is no objection to our attaining our lesser, temporal happiness also if we can."

The theme of securing our happiness both here and hereafter runs through the entire book. The author augments his thoughts with numerous quotations from secular works to a very great advantage. He is especially to be commended for his repeated and practical use of scripture texts.

WALTER J. SCHMITZ, S.S.

Book Notes

PAMPHLET NOTES

Similar to Conway's *Question Box* and Rumble and Carty's *Radio Replies* is *Platform Replies,* Vol. 1, by Very Rev. John Canon Arendzen (Westminster, Md.: Newman Bookshop. $1.75). The Foreword states, "The interest of this collection of queries on matters of Ethics and Religion lies mainly in the fact that they are genuine in the sense that they have been actually asked by 'the man in the street.' None of the questions are faked in any sense. . . . All that has been done with them is that here and there they have been slightly changed in grammatical form or shorn of irrelevant remarks."

Extracts from the original works of Thomas à Kempis have been selected and edited by Dr. Albin de Cigala under the title, *The Imitation of Mary.* The thirty passages of two pages each are accompanied by homilies and meditations, all arranged according to the fifteen mysteries of the Rosary (Westminster, Md.: Newman Press. Cloth, $2.25; paper, $1.00).

Accent on Purity by Joseph E. Haley, C.S.C., Department of Religion, University of Notre Dame, is a Catholic guide for sex education, delineating the role of teachers and parents. There is also a suggested instruction on purity for the adult to use for adolescent training and an extensive bibliography. (South Bend and Montreal: Fides Publishers. $2.25).

Mr. John J. Griffin, Supervisor of Old Age Assistance in Somerville, Mass., has compiled a representative and selective bibliography of some 1200 references, an extension of his 1946 mimeographed bibliography (*Classified Bibliography on Geriatrics and the Care of the Aged* [Somerville, Mass.: 57 School St., 1948], pp. 80, $2.10). Titles listed cover principal social, economic, and medical phases of care of the aged. The usefulness of the bibliography would have been much enhanced if even short annotations had been added.

EUGENE P. WILLGING

The Newman Press, of Westminster, Maryland, has begun the long-awaited American reprint of Dom Laurence Sheperd's translation of Abbot Prosper Gueranger's masterpiece, *The Liturgical Year.* When the publication is complete, the work will consist of fifteen volumes. The first, containing the introductory matter and the liturgy of Advent is now available (pp. x + 520. $4.00).

The original French edition of the first volume of *L'Année liturgique* was published in 1841. It was destined to become one of the most influential literary works in Catholic history. Abbot Gueranger's masterpiece has played a great part in the development of the liturgical movement, as we know it today. It is a genuine classic of Catholic literature. Despite the manifest advances in the study of the liturgy made during the course of the last century, *The Liturgical Year* is still a valuable work, and the Newman Press is to be congratulatel in making the excellent translation by Dom Sheperd again readily obtainable.

The publishing firm of P. J. Kenedy and Sons of New York have done an important service to American Catholic scholarship in publishing an English translation of the works of St. John Eudes. Two Eudist priests, Fathers Wilfrid E. Myatt and Patrick J. Skinner act as co-editors of these highly successful translations.

Two of the most recent volumes in this series are the Saint's *Letters and Shorter Works* and his treatise, *The Admirable Heart of Mary.* The former (Pp. xxxviii + 339), was